THE COMMUNION OF THE LAITY

W. E. SCUDAMORE

DEC 18 1991

THE COMMUNION OF THE LAITY.

THE COMMUNION OF THE LAITY.

AN ESSAY,

CHIEFLY HISTORICAL,

ON THE RULE AND PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH WITH RESPECT TO THE RECEPTION OF THE CONSECRATED ELEMENTS AT THE CELEBRATION OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

BY

W. E. SCUDAMORE, M.A.,

LATE RECTOR OF DITCHINGHAM,
AND FELLOW OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

Reprinted.

NITED THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY
BX
5149
.C5
S384
1902

London:
SKEFFINGTON & SON,
PUBLISHERS TO HIS MAJESTY THE KING.
1902.

PREFATORY NOTE.

At the suggestion of the Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells, this valuable Essay by the learned author of *Notitia Eucharistica* is reprinted by the Committee of *The Ladies' League.* The practices and principles which the author deprecates are now unhappily far more prevalent in our Church than in his days, and there is the greater need for the evidence he adduces that they are inconsistent both with Scripture and with Catholic Antiquity.

The work has been carefully reprinted, under Dr. Wace's supervision, from the original edition of 1855, except that two or three quotations have been rendered more exact.

September, 1902.

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION Pp. 1, 2.

CHAPTER I. Pp. 3-66.

SECTION I. Of Divine service in the primitive Church.

All present at the celebration of the Lord's Supper communicated.

Questions to which this rule gave rise. Tertullian.—Augustine.—Ambrose.—Clemens Alexandrinus.

Note [1], p. 6. Peculiar use of the word *synaxis*.

Note [3], p. 9. Frequency of celebration in the early Church.

SECT. II. The Scriptural accounts of our Lord's institution militate against the division of the rite into a Sacrifice and a Sacrament.

SECT. III. The analogy of the Jewish sacrifices equally against it.

Note [2], p. 18. Josephus misquoted by Mr. Wilberforce.

Note [2], p. 22. Mistakes of Mr. Wilberforce with regard to the Passover.

SECT. IV. The Sacrament and the commemoration inseparable according to the Fathers. Tertullian.—Basil.—Augustine.—Chrysostom.—The Council of Toledo.

We commemorate the sacrifice of Christ by *partaking* of the symbols. Basil.—Augustine.—Cyril of Alexandria.—Leo.—Pseudo-Ambrose.

Remission of sins ascribed not to the sacrifice, but to the Communion. Hippolytus. — Cyprian. — Ambrose. — Cyril of Alexandria. — The ancient Liturgies. Inference from this.

SECT. V. Early language respecting the *Consistentes* a proof that in the opinion of the first ages there could be no offering without partaking.

Peculiar custom at Alexandria. Clemens Alexandrinus.—Timothy I.—Eusebius Alex.

SECT. VI. Only mortal sin held to disqualify for Communion. Origen.—Cyprian.—Chrysostom.—Augustine.—The author *De Sacramentis*.—Eusebius of Alexandria.—Gennadius Massil.—Isidore of Seville.—Rabanus.—Walafridus Strabo.—The Third Council of Tours.—Zonaras.

Agreeably to this principle, S. Chrysostom declares that all who do not receive must be considered penitents.

SECT. VII. Ecclesiastical decisions against the presence of non-participants.—The ninth Apostolical Canon.—The Council of Antioch, A.D. 341.

The version of the Apostolical Canon by Dionysius Exiguus.—Its authority in the West.—Followed by Cresconius, Regino, Burchard, Ivo, Gratian.

Interpretation of the Apostolical Canon by the Eastern canonists. Zonaras.—Balsamon.

The origin of the *Antidoron*.

Note [4], p. 53. Opinion of Zonaras misrepresented.

Note [2], p. 56. Earliest notices of the *Antidoron*.

SECT. VIII. Testimony of writers, from the eleventh to the sixteenth century, to the primitive usage of communicating all present. Micrologus.—Speculum Anon.—John Beleth.—Petrus Blesensis.—Scriptor Anon. De Off. Div.—Hugo Cardinalis.—Durant —Ralph De Rivo.—Aquinas —De Lyra.—Denys à Ryckel.—Gemma Animæ.—Clichtovæus.—Cochlæus —Cassander.

SECT. IX. Testimony of Roman Catholic writers since the Council of Trent. Bona.—Sala.—Mabillon.—Schelstrate.—Dupin —Van Espen.—Martene.—Cigheri.—Maskell.

CHAPTER II. Pp. 67-94.

SECTION I. When the primitive rule was no longer observed, non-participants left before the Communion.

SECT. II. In the sixth century they were ordered not to leave before the Bishop gave his blessing;—which was before the Communion.

Note [2], p. 71. The Canons of Agde and Orleans on the departure of non-participants.

The mass considered over before the Communion began.

Note [4], p. 74. On the use of the Lord's Prayer and the blessing after the consecration.

SECT. III. Growing neglect of Communion by the laity.

Attempts to check the evil.

SECT. IV. Rise of solitary and private masses. They were condemned at first as involving a contradiction; but defended by Peter Damian, Innocent III., &c.

SECT. V. Theory of spiritual reception. The priest held to receive for the people, as the mouth for the members. Strabo.—Hugo Victorinus.—Honorius Augustod.—De Lyra.—Vincent Ferrer.—Eggeling and Biel.—Clichtovæus.—Myconius, &c.

SECT. VI. State of things at the time of the Reformation. Erasmus.—Bucer.—Council of Trent.

CHAPTER III. Pp. 95-121.

SECTION I. The *first* Book of Edward VI. ordered non-participants to leave the quire; the *second*, to leave the Church.—A proposition, A.D. 1559, that they should leave before the Nicene Creed.

The order to leave the Church imposed, as the nearest practicable approach to the primitive rule. Cranmer.—Guest.—Jewel.

SECT. II. Testimonies of English Divines before the last revision of the Liturgy. Whitgift.—Hooker.—Whitaker.—Field.—Overal.—Andrewes.—Bedel.—Laud, Juxon, Wren.—Montague.—John Forbes.—L'Estrange.—Cosin.

Note [1], p. 105. Overal and Cosin misrepresented by Mr. Wilberforce.

SECT. III. The warning to depart withdrawn at the last revision, because no longer necessary, and, therefore, not appropriate.

Its principle still approved by our Divines. Payne.—Beveridge.—Johnson.—Bingham.—Waterland.

Sect. IV. Undue reverence towards the consecrated elements. Adoration of the host.

Tendency to such excesses in the English advocates of staying without receiving.

Condemnation of gazing and adoring by the English Church in accordance with the teaching of the early Fathers. Origen.—The Bishops at Nicæa.—Athanasius.—Augustine.—Nilus.

Conclusion.

The Communion of the Laity.

INTRODUCTION.

THE following pages have been written in the hope of throwing some light on several questions relating to the attendance at the Lord's Table of persons who do not communicate. The subject is in itself a simple one; but it has, unfortunately, been much perplexed by the representations of Mr. Robert Wilberforce, in the concluding chapter of his treatise on the Eucharist. It is probable that the secession of that writer has caused many of his readers to suspect the general tendency of his previous teaching, and proved, through the mercy of God, their safeguard from much evil. But there are not wanting some who still defer to his opinions, and receive his statements without inquiry or misgiving; and it appears that, through their influence and ability, his ill-advised suggestions are likely to become a matter of practical and deeply serious importance. Under these circumstances, an historical review of the chief points at issue may prove an useful guide to many who, with restricted means of information,

are conscientiously endeavouring to understand the merits of the case. It will be seen that the compiler regards the views which Mr. Wilberforce endeavoured to recommend as unscriptural and uncatholic. He trusts, however, that he may not be thought to reflect in unkindness on any of those good and zealous men whose actions show that they have arrived at a different conclusion from himself. His words may fail to carry conviction, and induce a change of practice; but he will, at least, strive to "speak the truth in love," and not inflame the wound which he desires to heal.

CHAPTER I.

RULE OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH. PRINCIPLES AND ANALOGIES ON WHICH IT WAS BASED. EARLY AND MEDIÆVAL TESTIMONIES. CONFESSIONS OF LATER DIVINES IN THE COMMUNION OF ROME.

CHAP. I. SECT. I.

THE common worship of the first Christians might be said to consist wholly in a solemn, frequent, and stated celebration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. It is true that they offered prayers which had no direct reference to it, and chanted hymns, and heard God's Word in their assemblies both read and preached; but these were not duties peculiar to the faithful, and therefore, when practised by them, were not viewed as the substance of their sacrifice, but rather as accessories to the one great distinctive rite of Christian liturgy. The first believers at Jerusalem did not forsake the public worship of their countrymen, but after their conversion "continued daily with one accord in the Temple." If they assembled by themselves "in a house or chamber,"[1] it was

[1] Κατ' οἶκον, Acts ii. 46. "Learned men," says Beveridge (Cod. Prim. Eccl. Vind. l. ii. c. iii. § ix. Works, vol. xii. p. 26 Oxf. 1848), "have observed that κατ' οἶκον is the same as ἐν οἴκῳ, . . . in which manner the phrase is explained in this place by both the Syriac and Arabic versions." It is so used in Rom. xvi. 3, 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Col. iv. 15; Philem. 2. By οἶκος in these passages and in Acts viii. 3, understand the *chamber* in which the Christians assembled to break bread. See Schleusner, Parkhurst by Rose, &c.

specifically to "break bread." When the disciples at Troas, nearly thirty years later, were gathered together on the first day of the week, it is not said that this was to hear Paul preach, but again, "to break bread."[1] That this was the great recognized and stated object of the assemblies of the first Christians is also implied in the Apostolic rebuke of the disorderly Corinthians:—"When *ye* come together into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper"[2];—as if he had said, "The very purpose for which Christians meet is the celebration of the Supper of the Lord; but *you*, by your disorders, defeat that object, and deprive your celebration of every title to that character." To the same effect, Ignatius, the disciple of S. John, speaks as if this ordinance were identical with common prayer, or, at least, inseparably connected with it, when he relates of certain heretics, that they "abstained from Eucharist *and prayer* because they did not confess the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Christ."[3]

Much later also, at a time when other offices of public prayer are known to have been provided, the morning service, of which the Holy Communion was an inseparable part, was still regarded as the essential and proper worship of the Church. This is apparent from the language of S. Macarius, who died in 391. Illustrating the spiritual service of the Christian in

[1] Acts xx. 7. [2] 1 Cor. xi. 20.
[3] Ad Smyrn. c. vi. PP. Apost. tom. ii. p. 412. Oxon. 1838.

the "temple of the heart" by the external service of the Church, he refers still to the breaking of bread and prayers of the Apostles, though speaking of them, of course, as they were exhibited in the more elaborate ritual of his own day:—"Unless the lessons, psalm-singings, and the whole sequence of the Church's order came before, it would be improper for the priest to celebrate the Divine Mystery itself of the Body and Blood of Christ; and again, even if the whole ecclesiastical canon were observed, but the mystical thanksgiving of the oblation by the priest, and the communion of the Body of Christ did not take place, the order of the Church would not be fully kept, and the Divine Service of the Mystery would be defective."[1]

It appears from S. Chrysostom, who became Archbishop of Constantinople in 398, that at this period the general term σύναξις, *a gathering*, was in perfect strictness employed to denote solely those general assemblies for public worship at which the Eucharist was celebrated. This could only have arisen from its universal recognition as the great purpose for which Christians met together. His words are:—"The awful mysteries . . . which are celebrated *at every synaxis*, are called the Eucharist (thanksgiving), because they are a commemoration of many benefits."[2] By a still more remarkable

[1] De Caritate, c. xxix. In Galland. tom. vii. p. 207.

[2] Hom. xxv. in S. Matt. Ev. Opp. tom. vii. p. 352. Par. 1834—1839.

modification of its meaning, the word was also used, and unquestionably owing to the same cause, to signify the Sacrament itself.[1]

It is evident that, if the object for which the brethren "came together" was "to break bread," all who were present on any such occasion must have been expected to take a part in that holy action. To decline would be to renounce the communion of the faithful. Nay, so universal was the desire to partake of the sacred symbols at every celebration, that before the middle of the second century a custom was established of sending portions to those who were unavoidably absent. We learn this from Justin Martyr, who, in a brief account of the Christian worship, intended to correct the false notions of the heathen, after mentioning the consecration of the elements, describes their distribution in the following terms:—"Those who are called Deacons with us give to *each of those present* of the bread and wine tempered with water, that have been

[1] Chrysostom, Hom. ix. de Statuis (Opp. tom. ii. p. 115) has been often cited as an example; but this is clearly a mistake, as he is exhorting his hearers to come to *synaxis*, though they may have broken their fast. Another supposed instance given by Suicer and Casaubon is in Epiphanius, Adv. Hær. l. iii. tom. ii. c. xxii. (Opp. tom. i. p. 1104. Par. 1622); but see the notes of Petavius, in tom. ii. p. 349. Pseudo-Dionysius, however, frequently uses it in this sense, and inquires why that which is common to the Eucharist and other rites should be "ascribed to it pre-eminently, and it alone should be called *communion* and *synaxis*?" Eccles. Hierarch. c. iii. § i. Opp. tom. i. p. 282. Antv. 1634. The reason he gives is sufficiently improbable; viz., the union between Christ and His people, which is the result of faithful participation. Ibid. See the paraphrase of Pachymeres, p. 315.

blessed, to partake of, and carry thereof *to those who are not present*."[1] In some countries the laity were permitted to take a part of the consecrated elements home with them, and were thus enabled to sanctify those days on which they could not assemble with their brethren by a private observance of the proper act of Christian worship. The earliest mention of this practice occurs in Tertullian, at the end of the second century.[2]

The Clementine Liturgy cannot be cited as a cotemporary witness to the opinions and practice of the very first age; but it is competent to show what they were thought to have been at a somewhat later, but still early, period. Now in this ancient formulary we find it ordered that, after the Bishop, Presbyters, Deacons, &c., have communicated, "the children and then *all* the people" shall receive.[3]— In the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of Pseudo-Dionysius, which is of great value on the same ground, we have a full account of the manner in which the Eucharist was celebrated, as he and his cotemporaries supposed, in the first century. According to him, after Psalms

[1] Apol. i. c. 65. Opp. tom. i. p. 266. Jenæ, 1842.

[2] Ad Uxor. l. ii. c. v. Opp. tom. iii. p. 74. Sim. De Orat. c. xiv.; tom. iv. p. 15. Halæ, 1829. Other allusions occur in Cypr. de Lapsis, Tract. p. 132 (Brem. 1690); Ambr. de Exc. Fratr. l. i. n. 43, Opp. tom. vi. p. 526 (Venet. 1781); Greg. Naz. Or. xi., Opp. tom. i. p. 187 (Colon. 1690); Basil. M. ad Cæsar. Ep. cclxxxix., Opp. tom. ii. p. 1055 (Par. 1618), &c. The practice was forbidden by the Council of Saragossa, A.D. 380; can. iii. Labb. tom. ii. col. 1009.

[3] Tr. prefixed to Brett's Dissert. on Liturgies, p. 10. Lond. 1838.

had been sung and the holy Scriptures read, "the Catechumens, and beside them the possessed and those in penance, went without the sacred precinct, while those who were worthy of the sight and participation of the Divine things remained."[1] Again, he says of the Bishop, that "uncovering the undivided bread, and dividing it into many pieces, and dealing out the cup to *all*, he symbolically multiplies and distributes the unity."[2] The same practice is supposed in the fabulous lives of the Apostles under the name of Abdias.[3] Thus in the life of S. Thomas:—"Having blessed the bread, he communicated it to all"; and in that of S. Matthew:—"When they had answered, *Amen*, and the mysteries of the Lord had been celebrated, and *all* the Church had received mass,"[4] &c. In the Liturgy ascribed to S. Chrysostom is a prayer addressed to Christ (which might, or might not, have had a place in the earlier form on which that Liturgy was founded), that He would "vouchsafe to impart His undefiled Body and precious Blood" to the officiating clergy, and "through them to *all* the people."[5]

Even so late as the middle of the ninth century persons were still found who thought themselves

[1] C. iii. sect. ii. Opp. tom. i. p. 284.

[2] Ibid. sect. iii. n. 12; p. 299. Sim. in the paraphrase of Pachymeres, p. 327.

[3] Apost. Hist. l. ix. p. 103. Basil. 1552.

[4] Ibid. l. vii. p. 91.

[5] Liturg. PP. p. 103. Par. 1560. Brett, p. 39.

bound by the old rule. "There are some," says Walafridus Strabo, "who think it enough for the dignity of the sacraments to communicate once in the day, even if present at several masses; but there are others who wish to communicate, as in one, so in all the masses at which they are present in the day."[1] "There were then in the time of Strabo," observes Cardinal Bona, "some so tenacious of the original custom of communicating in the mass at which they were present, that they did not hesitate to receive the communion more than once in the day, if they were present at more than one mass."[2]

Of the original rule, then, it is not possible for us to entertain a doubt. There was, however, an occasional inconvenience in its observance, which led in the course of time to some very important changes. It might easily happen, especially in those Churches which had a daily[3] celebration, that a

[1] De Reb. Eccl. c. 22, apud Hittorp. de Div. Off. p. 409. Colon. 1568.

[2] Rer. Liturg. lib. i. c. xiv. Opp. p. 233. Antv. 1723.

[3] Justin Martyr, writing at Rome about the year 150, speaks of the Sacrament as celebrated every Sunday, Apol. i. u. s. It has been inferred from the expression *stato die*, in Pliny's well-known letter to Trajan, that the same custom prevailed in Asia Minor in the early part of the same century. Epp. l. x. Ep. xcvii. p. 566. Ed. Gesner, Lips. 1805. Tertullian, writing at Carthage about fifty years after Justin, implies a more frequent celebration; for he speaks of those who scrupled to receive on the Fast Days. De Orat. c. xiv.; tom. iv. p. 15. Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus, A.D. 220, speaks of the Body and Blood of Christ as *daily* consecrated. Fragm. in Prov. ix. l. Opp. tom. i. p. 282. Hamb. 1716. S. Cyprian in Africa, some thirty years later, mentions daily communion, as if it were the usual practice of all. De Orat. Dom. Tract. p. 147; Ep. lviii. ad Pleb. Thibar. p. 120. Eusebius of Cæsarea in Palestine expresses himself in the

person was indisposed to communicate, though, at the same time, not willing to forego the privilege of united prayer. An illustration occurs in a curious scruple mentioned by Tertullian about receiving on Fast Days:—"Most think that on the station days they ought not to be present at the prayers of the sacrifices, because the station must be broken by receiving the Body of the Lord." He meets the difficulty by suggesting a compromise:—"Will not your fast have a greater solemnity, if you have stood at the altar of God?—If you take the Body of the Lord and reserve it, [till the fast is over,] both ends will be gained,—participation in the sacrifice, and

same manner in the early part of the next century. Demonstr. Evang. l. i. c. x. p. 37. Par. 1628. S. Basil in Cappadocia, A.D. 370, declares daily communion to be useful, but says that the practice of his own Church was to have it four times a week (on Sunday, Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday), and on the days of the Martyrs. Ad Cæsar. as in note [2], p. 7. The Council of Toledo, A.D. 400, decreed that any clergyman living where there was a Church, and not presenting "the daily Sacrifice," should be deposed. Can. v. Labb. tom. ii. col. 1224. S. Jerome, who died in 420, says that it was "the custom at Rome for the faithful to receive the Body of Christ constantly" (*semper*), (Ep. xxx. pro lib. in Jov. Apol. Opp. tom. iv. col. 23. Par. 1706), and that the Churches of Rome and Spain were said to receive *daily*. Ep. lii. ad Lucin. col. 579. There can be no doubt that S. Augustine's account of the matter was true of the ages before him as well as his own:—"There are some customs which vary in different places and regions, as that some fast on Saturday, others not; some daily communicate in the Body and Blood of the Lord, others receive on certain days; in one place not a day passes without the offering, in another it is only on the Sabbath and the Lord's day, in a third on the Lord's day only." Ep. i. ad Januar. § 2. Ep. liv. Opp. tom. ii. col. 186. Par. 1836—1838. Sim. S. Jerome ad Lucin. u. s. who adds:—"*Unaquæque provincia abundet in sensu suo, et præcepta majorum leges Apostolicas arbitretur.*" From Acts xx. 7 compared with ii. 42, 46, it has been inferred that the same diversity of practice existed under the Apostles; there being, it would seem, a weekly communion at Troas, and a daily at Jerusalem.

fulfilment of the duty."[1] The scruple about daily communion is treated by S. Augustine in the following manner, in a passage which it may be desirable to give at some length:—"I have observed with grief and groans, that many of the anxieties of the weak are occasioned by the contentious obstinacy or superstitious fearfulness of certain brethren, who, in matters like this, which can never be determined with certainty, either by the authority of holy Scripture, or the tradition of the universal Church, or by their tendency to promote amendment of life, (only because some argument for them, such as it is, has come into the man's head, or because he was accustomed to do so in his own country, or because he has seen it in his travels which he imagines to be the more learned the farther they have been from his own people,) raise disputes so merely factious, that they think nothing to be right but what they do themselves. One would say, that the Eucharist ought not to be received daily. Should you ask, why?—Because, says he, certain days ought to be chosen, in which a man lives more purely and continently, that he may more worthily approach so great a sacrament. For 'whosoever shall eat unworthily, eats and drinks judgment to himself.' On the other hand, another says:—Nay, if the wound of sin and the violence of the disease are so great, that the use of such remedies must be

[1] De Orat. c. xiv.; tom: iv. p. 14.

deferred, every one ought to be removed from the altar by the authority of the Bishop that he may do penance, and be reconciled by the same authority. For receiving unworthily is receiving at a time, when one ought to be doing penance;—not that a man may either remove himself from communion, or restore himself to it at his own pleasure, when he likes. Moreover, if a person's sins are not so great that he be judged worthy of excommunication, he ought not to separate himself from the daily medicine of the Lord's Body. Some one perhaps more rightly settles the dispute between them, who advises that above all things he remain stedfast in the peace of Christ. But let each one do what according to his faith he piously believes ought to be done. For neither of them dishonours the Body and Blood of the Lord, but they are vying with each other in giving honour to the most salutary sacrament. . . . The one in his respect for it dares not receive daily; the other in his dares not miss a single day."[1] There can be no doubt that the controversy supposed by S. Augustine was suggested to him by the actual occurrences of his day; for we find S. Ambrose, several years before, speaking of some who abstained from communion as a self-imposed penance, though in a state, as he conceived, to profit by it:—"There are those, who think it a penance, if they abstain from the heavenly sacraments. These

[1] Ad Januar. Ep. i. §§ 2, 3; inter Epp. liv.; tom. ii. col. 186.

persons are too severe judges in their own case,—who impose on themselves a punishment, decline a remedy; —who ought even to grieve for their punishment, because by it they would be deprived of heavenly grace."[1]

There were three modes of acting in such a case. A person who did not wish to receive could absent himself from the common worship of the faithful, or he could be present, and either remain to the end, or leave before the celebration. It is probable that on common days, most would prefer to be absent altogether; but on the Lord's day, and other festivals, as long as no other public service was provided, this course was almost precluded, as it would inevitably expose those who adopted it to the suspicion of apostasy. Nor would they be free from all risk of a similar misconstruction, if they attended the first part of the service only and withdrew with the Catechumens, or with the Penitents; while to retire at any other time would necessarily produce confusion, as no such departure was contemplated, or provided for, in the prescribed ritual of the Church. They naturally would prefer,—and there is evidence that they did prefer,—to remain till the conclusion of the service. Nor was this course, it would appear, discountenanced by all the clergy, "some" of whom, according to Clemens Alexandrinus, "after dividing the Eucharist, as the custom was, left it to each of the people to take their share," on the ground that

[1] De Pœnit. l. ii. c. ix.; tom. v. p. 293.

"conscience is the best guide in taking or declining."[1] It is not probable that in those days of rule and discipline the matter would be allowed to remain long in this unsettled state. The Church would soon interfere, to sanction or forbid the rising practice. When her authoritative decision was first pronounced cannot be said with certainty; but from the above statement of Clemens, who died about the year 220, we may infer that the question was at least ripe for legislation by the middle of the third century.

CHAP. I. SECT. II.

II. Before we proceed to show how the Church dealt with this important subject, it may be well to set forth the grounds on which we must suppose her earliest decision to have been based.

It is conceded, I believe, by all, as implied in the narration of holy Scripture, that under the Apostles all who were present at the celebration partook, as a matter of course, of the consecrated elements of bread and wine. But, if I mistake not, it may be inferred further, from the plain teaching of our Lord and of S. Paul, that they could not have done otherwise, and that the grounds, on which a different course is sought to be justified, involve a serious misconception of the true nature of the Sacrament. A distinction is drawn by Mr. Wilberforce and others between the Sacrament and the sacrifice, and we are asked, why it should be thought unlawful to "join in the

[1] Strom. i. Opp. p. 271. Colon. 1688.

sacrifice, without going on to the Sacrament?"[1] The first reply to this inquiry is, that in Scripture the whole ordinance is clearly represented as indivisible and one, and the reception as an essential and integrant part of it. Christ gave to His disciples bread and wine, and said, "Take, eat and drink," *before* He declared the one to be His Body that was broken, or the other, His Blood poured forth.[2] Again, when He commanded, "This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me,"[3] His words assuredly imply that the remembrance of Him intended, viz., the commemoration of the sacrifice of His death, is altogether dependent on our eating and drinking of the ordained symbols of that sacrifice. He does not first institute the memorial, and then command us to partake thereof, but He commands us to partake, and when we are so doing, then to remember Him. S. Paul, commenting on His words, brings out yet more distinctly the relation, or rather the identity, which they exhibit between the commemoration and the Communion. "For as often," he explains, "as ye *eat* this bread and *drink* this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come."[4]

[1] Wilberforce on the Eucharist, ch. xiii. p. 387, 3rd ed.

[2] Matt. xxvi. 26-28; Mark xiv. 22-24; Luke xxii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25.

[3] 1 Cor. xi. 25.

[4] 1 Cor. xi. 26. Clichtovæus, a strong opponent of the Reformation, says:—"That the reception itself even of the Body and Blood of Christ is in remembrance of His passion S. Paul shows clearly, when he writes thus to the Corinthians, 'As often as ye eat,'" &c. Elucidatorium Eccles. P. iii. Can. Expos.; ad id *Hæc quotiescunque;* fol. 137, fa. 1. Basil. 1517.

We show, therefore, His death, we commemorate His sacrifice, when we *partake* of that bread and that cup which represent Him offered for our sins upon the Cross. This is the prescribed mode, the *only* prescribed mode, of that commemorative action. Unless we eat and drink, we do not "show His death." In short, by the very nature and appointment of the rite, we *cannot* "join in the sacrifice without going on to the Sacrament"; for without that which is here termed the Sacrament, there is no proper representation of the Sacrifice of Christ.

It should be remarked also that there is a peculiarity in every certain mention of this Sacrament occurring in holy Scripture, which is in strict accordance with the apparent teaching of the above-cited texts. Communion, and not oblation, is the most prominent idea in all. Thus in S. Paul's reasoning:—"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ? For we being many are one bread, one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread."[1] Even when he proceeds to a comparison between the Christian ordinance and the sacrifices of the heathen, the point of resemblance on which he dwells is not the offering, but the feast:—"Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils."[2] His preference for this aspect of the Sacrament is made

[1] 1 Cor. x. 16, 17. [2] 1 Cor. x. 21.

the more striking by its having led him, in carrying out the parallel, to designate the heathen altar by the somewhat unusual name of *table* :—"Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and of the table of devils."[1] Similarly, when he is condemning an abuse of the Eucharistic feast, he does not say :—"When ye come together, this is not *to show the Lord's death*," but "this is not *to eat the Lord's Supper*."[2] Even where an altar is mentioned in the Epistles, the use of it to which reference is made is properly that of a table :—"We have an altar, whereof they have no right to *eat*, who serve the tabernacle."[3]

It is clear then, as it appears to me, that, according to the intention of our Blessed Lord, and to the mind of His Apostles, the Eucharistic commemoration of His sacrifice is inseparable from the Communion of His Body and Blood,—and, therefore, that we can have no special interest in the one, unless we are partakers of the other also.

CHAP. I. SECT. III.

III. We are led to the same conclusion by the analogy of certain sacrifices under the law, in which the lay worshipper, who provided the victim, was under an obligation to eat of it. They were of three kinds, all included under the general title of Peace-offerings; but our attention may be confined to one, which has a peculiar bearing

[1] Ibid. The Jews used the word *table* to denote an *altar*, though not commonly. See Ezek. xxxix. 20; xli. 22; xliv. 16; Mal. i. 7, 12.

[2] 1 Cor. xi. 20. [3] Heb. xiii. 10.

on the subject, viz., the *Peace-offering for thanksgiving*, which the devout Israelite was encouraged to offer as a token of gratitude for mercies received. There is a strict correspondence, so far as the nature of the dispensations will permit it, between this ordinance of the Law and our Christian rite of Eucharist, or *Thanksgiving*, for the inestimable blessings which have been bestowed on us through Christ. But it was a law of this kind of sacrifice, and, what is more to the purpose, a law peculiar to it,—that after one stated portion of the victim had been consumed on the altar, and another given to the priest, the *whole* of the remainder was to be *eaten on the same day* by those who offered it.[1] In the case of Peace-offerings for a vow, or of spontaneous devotion, a part might be eaten on the second day, and if any then remained, it was to be burnt; but with the Peace-offering of Eucharist, no such alternative was permitted; it could only be eaten, and it must be eaten at once:—"When ye will offer a Sacrifice of Thanksgiving unto the Lord, offer it at your own will. On the same day it shall be eaten up, ye shall leave none of it until the morrow. I am the Lord."[2] This fact

[1] Levit. vii. 15. "He (*i.e.*, the offerer) shall not leave any of it until the morning."

[2] Levit. xxii. 29, 30. Yet Mr. Wilberforce (Eucharist, p. 389) says:—"To all other parties except the sacrificing priest the eating of the victim appears to have been optional." To prove this he professes to quote, not the Bible, from which he would have learnt differently, but Josephus:—"For the overplus, says Josephus, they that offer the sacrifice *may* eat of it during two days." He infers that their eating was optional from the use

furnishes a complete answer to the representation of Mr. Wilberforce, that the priest only was under an obligation to partake of the victim. The priest consumed a part, but the remainder, as we see, was also ordered to be eaten. Now how could obedience to this commandment be secured, unless it was made incumbent on some certain persons to partake of the remainder? And who could they be but those who made the offering, and sought to have the sacrifice

of the word *may*, to which he calls attention by printing it in italics. Yet, if Josephus had expressed himself thus, his obvious meaning would have been, not that after one prescribed portion had been burnt, and another given to the priest, the offerer might eat of the remainder or not, as it pleased him, but that he had *two* days allowed him to consume it in. But the fact is, that Josephus does not use the word *may*, or anything equivalent to it. Mr. Wilberforce has not consulted him, but trusted to Wilson's translation, in which I find the passage as he quotes it. What is it then that Josephus does say? He actually tells us, in the passage to which Mr. Wilberforce refers (see text, p. 22), that such sacrifices as he is there speaking of were "transacted by feasting of the sacrificers," and that "the offerers feast (not *may* feast) on the flesh that is left for two days." De Antiq. l. iii. c. ix. Opp. tom. i. p. 121. Oxon. 1720. Josephus is inexact in saying "*two* days" without distinction; for the statement is not true of Thank-offerings, properly so-called; though it is of other Peace-offerings. Maimonides says similarly of all Peace-offerings, "that they were eaten within two days and one night." De Sacrif. tr. i. c. x. § xiii. p. 49. Lond. 1683. Yet other Jewish authorities, as Abarbanel and Philo, have observed the distinction, and accounted for it. See De Compeigne's note on Maimon. u.s.

Furthermore, there were, among the Rabbis, two explanations of the general Hebrew word for Peace-offerings, which were founded on the notorious circumstance, that "in this kind of sacrifices, God, *the offerers*, and the priests, each had their share." Some derived it from שָׁלַם *to be at peace;* because the *common* feast of God and man was a token of peace between them: others from the same word in the sense of *paying;* because a prescribed portion was assigned as a due to each of the aforesaid several parties. Outram de Sacrif. l. i. c. xi. § i. p. 114. Lond. 1677. These explanations both imply that the worshipper was as much bound to consume his portion, as he was to burn that which was assigned to God.

imputed to them? There really can be no doubt whatever that it was as much the duty of the lay worshipper to eat his portion, as it was of the priest to consume his. Indeed, the law implies that in Peace-offerings, *i.e.*, in *all* those sacrifices in which the offerer was permitted to eat of the victim, such eating was of the very essence of the rite, and a condition of its being imputed:—"If any of the flesh of the sacrifice of his Peace-offering be eaten at all on the third day, it shall not be accepted, neither shall it be imputed to him that offereth it."[1] The remainder of the victim, then, was to be consumed within a prescribed time, by a company of lay worshippers, or the sacrifice was not acceptable to God, or imputed to him that offered it. We are not told, indeed, in so many words, that he was himself actually to partake; but it is most unreasonable to suppose, indeed it is quite incredible, that the person, or persons, who provided the victim, whose gratitude for some benefit received was the avowed occasion of the public acknowledgment of a Thank-offering, should have been held at liberty to call in a party of strangers to do that which was to secure their interest in the sacrifice, while they themselves stood by, and joined not in the feast. I presume that no other evidence will be thought necessary to confirm an inference so palpable and certain. It may be found however, if it should be

[1] Lev. vii. 18.

asked for, in the actual practice of the Jews. It is a matter of fact, that, according to their custom, it was the *offerer* who consumed the victim. Josephus, for example, tells us that such sacrifices were "transacted by feasting of *the sacrificers*," and again, that after sprinkling the altar with the blood, burning the fat, &c., and "giving the breast and right shoulder to the priest, the *offerers* feasted on the flesh that was left."[1] And similarly Abarbanel:— "The remainder the masters of the sacrifice eat."[2]

The Passover was of the nature of a Thank-offering, being appointed to commemorate the deliverance of the children of Israel from the bondage of Egypt. Moreover we learn from Scripture that it was an express type of the Sacrifice of Christ, the Lamb of God.[3] A strong analogy must therefore be supposed to subsist between this ordinance, and the Sacrament by which we commemorate our deliverance from a bondage typified by that of Egypt, and show forth the same Sacrifice by retrospect and in remembrance. But it is manifest that all who were comprised in the command to keep the Passover were under a strict obligation to eat of the lamb therein offered. In fact, by "keeping" it, the law explained itself to mean "*eating* it, with unleavened bread and bitter

[1] De Antiq. l. iii. c. ix. Opp. tom. i. p. 121.

[2] Exord. Comment. in Levit. ad calc. Majemonidæ Tract. de Sacrif. pp. 247, 333.

[3] 1 Cor. v. 7.

herbs"[1]; while it declared that those who "forbore to keep it" should be "cut off from among their people."[2]

[1] Num. ix. 11. "They shall keep it, [and] eat it with unleavened bread and bitter [herbs]";—the second clause being in apposition with the former.

[2] Num. ix. 13. "The man that is clean and is not in a journey, and forbeareth to keep the Passover, even the same soul shall be cut off from among his people." Mr. Wilberforce, p. 390, says that "there is no injunction in Scripture that women should eat of it." Neither, it might be answered, is there any injunction that they should *offer* it. His argument required that they should be enjoined to offer, though not enjoined to eat. There can be no doubt, however, that women were required to keep the Passover, and that they were included in the general commands of Holy Scripture. It is notorious that the Jews were of this opinion. "Men and women," says Maimonides, "were equally bound by this precept." Tr. i. de Pasch. c. i. § i. p. 3. The only distinction made by the Rabbis was, that if women from any defilement, or physical hindrance, or other innocent cause, did not keep it at the proper time, they were not considered bound to observe it, as men similarly situated were, on the same day of the next month. Ibid. c. v. § viii. p. 27; c. vii. § iii. p. 35.

Mr. Wilberforce quotes from the Gemara Hieros. to the effect that "it was held by the Jews illegal to offer the lamb for a sodality in which none were able to partake of it." This tells against him, for it implies that those who could not eat were not allowed to offer. He adds, therefore:—"But the incapacity of some members was no reason why it should not be offered for the sodality at large." For this he appeals to the same authority, giving the following extract in a note:—"Pro comedentibus suis, et pro non comedentibus suis; pro annumeratis et pro non annumeratis; pro circumcisis, et præputiatis; pro immundis et mundis, est legitimum." Gemara Hieros. c. v. § iii. in Ugolini's Thesaur. Antiq. Sacr. tom. xvii. col. dccxc. But Mr. Wilberforce appears to have misunderstood his author. The meaning is, not that those who could not eat were supposed to have an equal interest in the sacrifice with those who could, but that it was not vitiated by the victim's having been offered in the name of *some* who proved unable to partake of it. If it happened that *none* of those in whose names it was slain partook of it, the sacrifice became unlawful, and was expiated by a sin-offering. See the Gemara, c. vi. § x.; Ugol. u.s. col. dcccxxiv. Moreover, in direct opposition to the opinion of Mr. Wilberforce, it was actually a principle with the Jews that, if any member of a sodality, on whose behalf the victim had been slain, did not eat of it, *he lost his part in the offering*, as well as in the feast:—"If one should

Our inference with regard to the Christian Passover may be expressed in the words of S. Athanasius :— "Our Saviour, since He was changing the typical for the spiritual, promised them that they should no longer eat the flesh of a lamb, but His own, saying, 'Take, eat and drink ; this is My Body, and My Blood.' When we are, then, *nourished* by these things, we shall also, my beloved, properly keep the feast of the Passover." [1]

slay for persons of whom part could eat a piece of the size of an olive, and part could not, &c., he would not be at fault, forasmuch as those who were qualified would eat as the law prescribes ; but the rest would be excluded, *as if they had not been in the mind of him who slew the victim.*" Majemon. u.s. c. ii. § v. p. 12. But Mr. Wilberforce has been able to find one Rabbi who "goes so far as to say that if the lamb fell short, so that none remained for a person who was legally bound to eat, he was exempted from the duty of repeating the rite, because the blood of the first victim had been sprinkled in his name." If this had been found in the Bible itself, it would have been to the purpose ; though an exceptional case, and that necessarily of most rare occurrence, could have given no adequate sanction to the *general* practice which it is sought to introduce. As it is, however, this extreme opinion of a single Rabbi, for such it is confessed to be, is entitled to no weight. It is obviously one of those expositions, though comparatively an innocent one, by which the Jewish casuists "made the commandment of God of none effect."

Mr. Wilberforce's last argument from the Passover is, that "the benefits of the ordinance, regarding it as a sacrifice for the nation at large, were not supposed to be confined to those by whom it was eaten." This may be true, but it is wholly beside the question. We should not deny that the celebration of the Eucharist is a means of benefit *to the Church at large ;* but the point at issue is, whether it is a means of *special* benefit to individual members of the Church, who, though present at it, decline to partake of the consecrated elements.

[1] Festal Epistles, Ep. iv. p. 34 ; Engl. Tr. Oxf. 1854. It is singular that while one peculiarity of the Church of Rome is defended by maintaining that eating of the paschal lamb was left optional ; an argument in favour of another is sought from the fact that it was not optional. Thus Bishop Fisher urges the analogy in support of transubstantiation :—"That old lamb was a kind of a figure and a shadow of this new ; and similarly that

In arguing from a Jewish sacrifice to the Christian sacrament, no inference, however probable, can be considered certain, unless it is confirmed by the inspired writers of the New Testament. Without the seal of their authority the argument may be sufficient for the purpose for which it is now employed, namely, to overturn a conclusion drawn from an erroneous statement of the same premises; but it can afford no *positive* guidance either as to the doctrine, or as to the use of the evangelical ordinance. In this instance, however, we have the direct testimony of an Apostle to the interpretation which we have put upon the Scripture of the Old Testament. Our appeal to the Levitical law is in reality superfluous; for we are plainly taught by S. Paul that, in those sacrifices to which the Eucharist may be compared, the Jew became "partaker of the altar" by being partaker of the offering:—"Behold Israel after the flesh. Are not they which *eat* of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?"[1] He not only asserts the principle as holding good of the Jewish rite, but

Passover, of our Passover. Wherefore that this our Truth, that Christ Jesus, I say, our true Lamb, may answer in some manner to the past shadow, it is necessary that He also should be corporally eaten. But that no where takes place but in the Eucharist, under the appearance of bread. Wherefore it is also inferred that He is truly present there, forasmuch as He is truly eaten by us." C. Œcolamp. l. v. Præf. Opp. pp. 1132, 3. Wirceb. 1597.

[1] 1 Cor. x. 18. Wicelius, a Roman Catholic divine, A.D. 1534, draws the same inference, viz., that *offering* and *eating* are in such a case equivalent to each other, *quod oblatio et esus nihil inter se dissideant.* De Euch. p. 324. Colon. 1549.

extends its application to the Christian; for it is solely with a view to illustrate the latter that he refers to the Mosaic ordinance at all.

We may infer, then, without fear of error, from the analogy of those sacrifices to which the holy Eucharist is compared in Scripture, as well as from such accounts of it as are preserved therein, that, unless we *partake* of the consecrated symbols, we do not commemorate aright the Sacrifice which they are ordained to represent; in other words, that unless we eat we do not "offer"; and consequently that those who "assist without receiving," have no greater interest in the celebration than they would have, in common with the whole Church, if they were not present.

CHAP. I. SECT. IV.

IV. This identity of the Sacrament with the commemoration, of the Communion with the sacrifice, is constantly recognized in the language of the early Christian writers. With them to have a part in the sacrifice was to receive, and to "offer" was the same thing as to communicate. We have already seen this in Tertullian, when he advises those who scrupled to communicate during a fast to reserve the Sacrament until the fast was over; by which means, he says, they would both "participate in the sacrifice," and fulfil their other duty.[1] S. Basil directs that certain penitents shall only stand with the faithful for a time "without

[1] De Orat. c. xiv.; tom. iv. p. 14. See p. 10.

partaking of the oblation," but when that time has expired, shall "partake of the Sacraments."[1] Similarly, "to be removed from the altar" means in the language of S. Augustine and of the ancient Church to be forbidden to communicate.[2] S. Chrysostom says:—"Many partake of this sacrifice once a year, some twice,"[3] &c.—meaning that they communicated so often. So again, he speaks of one who had "received the precious Body, and partaken of so great a sacrifice."[4] With the same Father, to "approach the sacrifice" is to "partake of the mysteries," or "of the Body of Christ"[5]; and "to have the benefit of the sacrifice" is equivalent to "having the benefit of the table."[6] In a decree of the Council of Toledo, A.D. 681, to "partake of the sacrifice," to "eat of the offering," and to "partake of the altar," are expressions employed to signify precisely the same act and privilege. In condemning certain priests, who, when obliged to celebrate more than once a day, communicated only at the last celebration, the Council argued thus:—"Behold the Apostle says, Are not they which eat the victims partakers of the altar? . . . What kind of sacrifice

[1] Ep. Canon. ad. Amphil. can. lvi.; tom. ii. p. 775.

[2] Ep. I. ad Januar. § iii. See p. 12.

[3] Hom. xvii. in Ep. ad Heb. c. x.; tom. xii. p. 242.

[4] Hom. c. Ludos, tom. vi. p. 328.

[5] Hom. iii. in Ep. ad Eph. c. i.; tom. xi. p. 24: Hom. i. in Prod. Jud.; tom. ii. p. 454.

[6] Hom. lxxxii. in S. Matt. xxvi. 26; tom. vii. pp. 889, 890.

will that be of which not even the sacrificer is known to have partaken." [1]

The truth taught indirectly by such parallelisms as these is also implied whenever it is said that we commemorate the sacrifice of Christ *by partaking* of the appointed symbols of His Body and Blood. To this effect S. Basil tells us, "that we must eat the Body and drink the Blood of the Lord for a memorial of His obedience unto death" [2]; and S. Augustine, that "Christians celebrate the memorial of that same accomplished sacrifice by the most holy oblation and participation of the Body and Blood of Christ." [3] Elsewhere the latter Father says:—"We call that only the Body and Blood of Christ, which, taken from the fruits of the earth, and consecrated by the mystic prayer, we duly receive to our spiritual health for a memorial of the Lord's passion for us." [4] S. Cyril of Alexandria:—"The table with the shewbread signifies the unbloody sacrifice, through which we receive blessing, when we eat the bread from heaven" [5]; and again:—

[1] Conc. Tolet. xii. cap. v. Labb. tom. vi. col. 1230; Cratian, P. ii. Dist. ii. c. xi. *Relatum est.* The phrase *altaris participatio* is used to this day in the canon of the Mass for *communicating;* when the priest prays, "ut quotquot ex hac altaris participatione sacrosanctum Filii Tui corpus et sanguinem sumpserimus, omni benedictione cœlesti et gratia repleamur."

[2] Mor. Reg. xxi. c. iii.; tom. ii. col. 304.

[3] C. Faust. l. xx. c. xviii.; tom. viii. col. 542.

[4] De Trin. l. iii. c. iv. n. 10; tom. viii. col. 1225.

[5] De Ador. in Spir. et verit. l. xiii. Opp. tom. i. p. 457. Par. 1638.

"The participation of the holy mysteries is a true confession and commemoration of His dying and rising again for us."[1] S. Leo says that it is God's mercy in Christ, "whereby the Passover of the Lord is lawfully celebrated in the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth; while, the leaven of the old wickedness being cast away, the new creature is inebriated and fed from the Lord Himself."[2] In the commentary on the Epistles which passed long under the name of S. Ambrose, we read:—"Because we are delivered by the death of the Lord, mindful thereof, we, in eating and drinking the Flesh and Blood which have been offered for us, signify that we have obtained the New Testament in these. . . . The Testament was established by blood, because blood is the witness of God's benefit. In a figure whereof we receive the mystic cup of Blood for the protection of our body and soul."[3]

The early Christians believed unanimously that remission of sin was one of the graces imparted to the penitent faithful through the holy Eucharist. Now if the distinction which Mr. Wilberforce adopts between the sacrifice and sacrament be truly ancient and legitimate, we should expect to find this gift especially connected with the sacrificial part of the ordinance. Propitiation, or the impetration of favour,

[1] Comm. in S. Joh. Ev. c. xx. v. 16. l. xii.; tom. iv. p. 1105.
[2] Serm. lxiii. de Pass. xii. Opp. tom. i. col. 247. Ven. 1753.
[3] In 1 Cor. xi. 26; inter Ambr. Opp. tom. vii. p. 174.

confessed to be undeserved, which includes, of course, forgiveness, has been the main object of sacrifice in all ages, and among all nations of the world; and it was emphatically and especially the end and effect of that sacrifice, which is commemorated in the Eucharist. But is it under this aspect that we find the Eucharist affirmed by ancient writers to convey the pardon of our sins?—Far from it. Sometimes, indeed, they ascribe the gift in general terms to the Divine ordinance as a whole, but far more frequently to the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ which it imparts: and never, unless I am strangely deceived, to any supposed sacrifice distinct from that communion. Thus S. Hippolytus:—"He gave us His Divine Flesh and His precious Blood, to eat and to drink them for the remission of sins."[1] S. Cyprian:—"After draining the Blood of the Lord, and the cup of salvation, . . . the woful and sad breast, that was oppressed by torturing sins, may be loosed by the joy of the Divine pardon."[2] S. Ambrose:—"He who receives shall not die by a sinner's death; for this bread is the remission of sins."[3] And again:—"Be there, prepared that thou mayest receive to thyself a defence; that thou mayest eat the Body of the Lord Jesus, in which is remission of sins, entreaty for reconciliation with God,

[1] Fragm. in Prov. ix. 1. Opp. tom. i. p. 282.

[2] Ep. lxiii. p. 153.

[3] De Patriarch. Bened. c. ix. n. 39; tom. i. p. 469.

and for eternal protection."[1] Cyril of Alexandria :— "Eat bread that purges out that ancient bitterness, and drink wine that deadens the pain of that wound."[2] And similarly, if I mistake not, in all the ancient Liturgies; as in the Clementine :—"That all who shall partake of it may be confirmed in godliness, may receive remission of their sins, may be delivered from the devil and his wiles," &c.[3]; in that under the name of S. James :—"We give Thee thanks, O Christ our God, for that Thou hast thought us worthy to partake of Thy Body and Blood for remission of sins and life eternal"[4]; in those of Basil :—"Grant that we may without condemnation partake of these undefiled and life-giving mysteries, for the remission of sins, for the communion of the Holy Ghost."[5] A similar petition occurs in that ascribed to Chrysostom, in which also the priest is directed to say to himself and to the deacon while communicating :—"This hath touched thy lips and will take away thine iniquities, and thoroughly purge thy sins."[6] Expressions of the same doctrine were preserved in the corrupted Liturgies of the early

[1] In Ps. cxviii. Heth, n. 48; tom. iii. p. 319.

[2] Hom. in Myst. Cœn. Opp. tom. v. P. ii. p. 374. Many such examples occur (incidentally) in the collection of passages recently published by Dr. Pusey in "The Doctrine of the Real Presence." See pp. 414, 460, 469, 603, 690, 691.

[3] Brett's Liturgies, p. 7.

[4] Liturg. Patr. p. 37. Brett, p. 21.

[5] Lit. PP. p. 66. Brett, pp. 54, 61.

[6] Lit. PP. p. 106. Brett, p. 42.

heretics.[1] The inference which I would draw from the universality of this belief has been already intimated, viz., that the early Christians knew nothing of that distinction, for which Mr. Wilberforce and his followers contend, between the sacrifice and the Sacrament. If they had thus divided the institution of Christ into a communion and a sacrifice available even to those who do not communicate, the very nature of a sacrifice would have compelled them to ascribe the gift of pardon, which it conveys, to the propitiatory power of the oblation, rather than, as they did, to an actual reception of the Sacrament.

CHAP. I. SECT. V.

V. But perhaps the clearest evidence that we can give, to prove that in the early Church to offer meant to communicate, is found in the language of those ancient canons, which speak of the form of penance known by the name of *consistentia*. In many churches at least, if not in all, and from a very early period, penitents in the last stage of their probation were allowed to "communicate with the faithful in prayers," though still forbidden to partake of the holy Eucharist. This communion in prayers, however, is generally thought to imply their presence, as non-communicants, during the celebration[2]; and

[1] See those of Nestorius and Severus in Brett, pp. 72, 83.

[2] By *the prayers*, are understood those of the Communion Office. "This part of the service being wholly spent in prayer, and that by the communicants only, is therefore peculiarly distinguished by the name of εὐχαὶ πιστῶν, The Prayers of the Faithful, by the Council of Laodicæa

their supposed presence is accordingly pleaded as an early witness to the principle of "offering without partaking." We are asked, "If they did not offer the sacrifice without eating, what were they there for at all"?[1] We might reply, that it was the very *gravamen* of their penance to behold others in the enjoyment of a blessing of which they were unworthy, as in an earlier stage, it was their punishment to remain at the church door while others entered. The question, however, is one which ought not to be asked; for it is a matter of perfect certainty that, for whatever purpose they might be there, it was not, as conjectured, that they might "offer the sacrifice" without communicating. The proof of this is both direct and decisive. The Council of Ancyra, A.D. 315, speaks of the *consistentes*, as "communicating in the prayers,"[2] or "communicating *without oblation*,"[3] for a fixed time, and at the end of that "attaining to the perfect," *i.e.*, being admitted to partake in the holy Eucharist. Ten years later, the Nicene Fathers directed that the penance of voluntary apostates

(Can. xix. Bev. Pand. tom. i. p. 461), which speaks of them as coming after the prayers of the Catechumens, and their dismission. In other canons they are called the common prayers of the people, and absolutely *the prayers*, without taking notice of any other prayers in the Church." Bingham, b. xiii. ch. i. sect. iii.; vol. i. p. 555. Waterland was of opinion that the *consistentes* were not present at the celebration. See Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, ch. xiv. Works, vol. iv. p. 791. Oxf. 1843.

[1] Right of all the Baptized to be Present, &c.; p. 24. Masters, Lond. 1854.

[2] Cann. iv. xxiv. Pandect. Bevereg. tom. i. pp. 377-399.

[3] Cann. v. vi. viii. Ibid.

should conclude with two years of "communion with the people in prayers *without oblation*."[1] Towards the end of the same century we have frequent mention of the *consistentes* in the Second Canonical Epistle of S. Basil. They are then spoken of as "abstaining from the oblation," until admitted "to the communion of the good," *i.e.*, the Eucharist;—as "standing with the faithful, but not partaking in the oblation," until their term had expired, but after that "partaking of the Sacraments."[2] There is no escape from the conclusion to which this language drives us. It proves incontestably, that in the mind of the early Church *offering* included *partaking*, and *partaking* implied *offering*,—and, consequently, that the "separation of the sacrifice from the Sacrament," for which some now contend, was utterly unknown to it.

If, however, the subject should be thought by any to require further elucidation, it may be found in the commentaries of the Greek canonists. According to Zonaras, "to communicate without oblation" is "to pray with the faithful without being allowed to receive the Sacraments."[3] Alexius Aristenus says that it is "to communicate with the faithful in the prayers to the completion of the mystic rite, but without having a part in the Divine reception"[4];

[1] Can. xi. Pand. tom. i. p. 71.
[2] Ep. ad Amphil. can. lvi.; tom. ii. p. 775.
[3] In can. Nic. xi. Pand. tom. i. p. 72.
[4] In can. Ancyr. Ibid. p. 377.

and Balsamon explains that "to be admitted without oblation" is to be "taken into communion with the Church without being thought worthy of the Divine Sacrament," or as he also expresses it, "of the Divine reception."[1]

But granting, it may perhaps be said, that it has been a great mistake to plead the presence of the *consistentes* as a proof that we can "join in the sacrifice without going on to the Sacrament," is it not possible that the early Church, in using the language that has been adduced, and the Greek canonists in explaining it, may have been contemplating the case of the *consistentes* only, and thus intended to express a fact with regard to them, rather than a principle? Is it not possible that, notwithstanding that language, they might after all have supposed that in the very different case of persons who had not been excommunicated, but felt reluctant to receive from want of special preparation, or other such cause, there could perhaps be an acceptable offering without reception? Such a conjecture would, I believe, be fully answered by what has been said in Section IV.; but as the case suggested did actually occur, it will be well to adduce such notices of it as are to be met with in early writers, and to consider which way their testimony leans. We may, then, reply further, that for five centuries or more it was only in the Church

[1] In can. Nic. x. Ibid. p. 72.

of Alexandria, so far as I can learn, that persons not under penance were encouraged, or permitted without the imputation of irregularity, to be present to the end without receiving. The language, however, of those from whom we have the knowledge of this exception affords no sanction to the hypothesis that has been now stated. S. Clement, as we have already seen, merely says that *some* of the clergy "after dividing the Eucharist" left it to the conscience of each person present whether he would receive or not.[1] Towards the end of the fourth century, Timothy I., a Patriarch of the same Church, in reply to a question respecting the lawfulness of celebrating in the presence of heretics, says:—"In the Divine oblation, the Deacon, before the kiss of peace, cries out, 'Ye that are not communicants walk out.' They ought not to be present then, unless they promise to repent."[2] The custom for some to remain who did not partake is clearly implied in the question, and tacitly allowed in the answer. If none had been permitted to remain, the Bishop would certainly have said that not heretics only, but all who did not partake must be excluded. A third notice of the custom, belonging probably to the middle of the fifth century, is a distinct recommendation of it. It proceeds from a Bishop, always described as Eusebius the Alexandrian, though over what Church he presided is not known:—"If

[1] Strom. i. p. 271. See p. 14.

[2] Pandect. Bever. tom. ii. p. 167.

conscience condemns thee of wicked and flagitious actions, decline the Communion until thou hast corrected it through repentance; but stay during the prayer, and leave not the Church until dismissed."[1] "Finish *thy* prayer, on no account quitting before the dismission." Not one of these writers makes the least mention of "offering without partaking," and yet from the last it seemed absolutely required, if he had held that such a thing was possible. Surely, if he had been of the opinion of Mr. Wilberforce, he would have said:—"If you are unfit to communicate, at least do not fail to offer; the sacrifice is of avail even to those who do not partake of the victim." But he says nothing of the kind, and his silence is a clear proof that, though he believed a person not communicating would be benefited by "finishing *his* prayer," he did *not* believe, any more than S. Chrysostom, that he could by remaining obtain a special interest in the *Church's* commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ. The question probably never occurred to Eusebius, but it did happen to the great Father whom I have named to speak separately, in a passage of rapid thought, of a worthiness of the reception and a worthiness of the sacrifice, and his language shows that he believed one who was not fit

[1] De Die Dom. § ii.; in Galland. tom. viii. p. 252. The first clause in the original runs thus:—Εἰ δὲ κατακρίνει σε τὸ συνειδὸς ἐν πονηροῖς καὶ ἀτόποις ἔργοις, τὴν μὲν κοινωνίαν παραίτησαι, μέχρις ἂν διορθώσῃς ἑαυτὴν διὰ μετανοίας.

to partake must also be unfit to offer:—"Art thou not worthy of the sacrifice nor of the participation?" He is addressing persons who wished to stay without receiving, and he assumes that, if they had their wish, the sacrifice would profit them as little as the participation. His conclusion is that they ought not to stay at all:—"If so, then neither art thou of the prayer," *i.e.*, of the prayers used at the celebration.[1]

It is evident, then, that, when the case before us, of a person in full communion with the Church declining to receive though present, was actually brought under the consideration of the early Fathers, they had no disposition to regard him as "joining in the sacrifice." Some few thought his attendance a proper act of devotion; others condemned it strongly: but they agreed in this, that they supposed him to remain to *pray*, and not to *offer*.

The same thing might be inferred, *a fortiori*, from an early rule which forbade the clergy to receive offerings for the use of the holy table from persons

[1] Hom. iii. in Ep. ad Eph. c. i.; tom. xi. p. 26. "He does not mean that prayer in general requires the same preparation that the Communion does, or that every one who may be properly admitted to the former may be as properly admitted to the latter also. . . . But what Chrysostom meant was, that it was very absurd and even downright impudent for a man to claim a right to stand by, all the while that the Communion was administered, and to *join* in those most *sacred* and *mystical* prayers and hymns which were proper to it, and at the same time to pretend that he was not worthy of it; for if he really was not worthy to *receive*, he was not worthy to be *present* during that holy solemnity, or to bear a part in the *prayers* which peculiarly belonged to it." Waterland's Review, c. xiv.; vol. iv. p. 790.

who did not intend to partake of them at it.[1] They were not even allowed to supply the elements, and how can it be imagined that they were believed by those who thus stigmatized them to be able, if present in Church, to "join in the sacrifice" for which the elements were provided?

It is quite certain, then, that in the early Church there could be no inducement to permit the presence of a non-communicant from the existence of any belief that he could offer without partaking, or, as Mr. Wilberforce expresses it, that he could derive benefit from "joining in the sacrifice without going on to the Sacrament."

CHAP. I. SECT. VI.

VI. I next proceed to show that the opinions, which prevailed generally for several centuries respecting fitness for the reception of the Sacrament, were not such as would in themselves have induced those who held them to recommend persons to be present without partaking. Some of them might have permitted or even urged it upon other grounds; but they could not have done so for the chief reason that we hear alleged as a motive for encouraging the practice among ourselves; viz., that an habitual communicant may sometimes, though free from great sin, esteem himself unfit to communicate, and yet desire to be present at the celebration.

The common persuasion seems to have been that

[1] Conc. Illiber. circ. A.D. 305, can. xxviii. Labb. tom. i. col. 973.

all who were not guilty of *deadly* sin not only might communicate, but ought by all means to do so, whenever they were able, infirmities notwithstanding, or rather as a remedy against them. In other words, all who were not excommunicated, or deserving of excommunication, were held bound to receive constantly; *i.e.*, as often as the rite was administered, unless kept away from the assemblies of the faithful by sickness, necessary business, or other lawful cause. Thus Origen supposes those whom he warns not to partake to have sinned grievously and to be in danger of perdition:—"When thy soul is sick and oppressed by the maladies of thy sins, art thou at ease, dost thou care nought for Gehenna, and despise and mock the punishment of the eternal fire? Dost thou esteem lightly the judgment of God, and despise the warning of the Church? Art thou not afraid to partake of the Body of Christ, approaching the Eucharist as if thou wert clean and pure, as if there were nothing unworthy in thee, and in all these things dost thou think that thou escapest the judgment of God?"[1] Cyprian, commenting on the Lord's Prayer:—"We daily ask for this bread to be given to us, lest we, who are in Christ, and receive the Eucharist daily for the food of salvation, should by the commission of some more grievous sin (while, being kept away and not communicating, we are forbidden the bread of heaven,) be separated from the body of

[1] Hom. ii. in Ps. xxxvii. § 6. Opp. tom. ii. p. 688. Par. 1733.

Christ."[1] S. Chrysostom :—"Let no one be there who is insincere, no one who is laden with iniquity, no one who has poison in his mind, lest he partake to condemnation. I do not say this to frighten you, but to make you safe. . . . Let no one therefore have wicked thoughts within ; but let us purify our mind ; for we are approaching a pure sacrifice. Let us make our soul holy ; for *this may be done even in one day*. How and by what means ? If thou hast aught against thine enemy, put away wrath ; heal the wound ; make an end of the enmity, that thou mayest receive healing from the Table."[2] S. Augustine :—"Take care then, brethren ; eat the heavenly bread spiritually : take innocence to the altar with you. Though your sins be of daily commission, in any wise *let them not be mortal*. Before you approach to the altar attend to that which you say :—'Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.' Forgive : it shall be forgiven thee. *Approach without fear :* it is bread, not poison."[3] For mortal sins, *i.e.*, "for sins of which the Apostle says, They who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven," he prescribed abstinence, but as a recognized part of public penance, to which he advises the secret sinner to submit :—"Let such a sentence proceed from his own mind,

[1] De Orat. Dom. Tract. p. 147. The passage is quoted by S. Augustine c. Epp. Pelag. l. iv. § 25 ; tom. x. col. 894 : and De Don. Persev. § vii. ; col. 1398 ; and by many other early writers.

[2] Hom. i. in Prod. Jud. ; tom. ii. pp. 453, 454.

[3] Tract. in Joh. Ev. xxvi. § 11 ; tom. iii. P. ii. col. 1983.

that he judge himself unworthy to partake of the Body and Blood of Christ, that he who fears to be separated from the kingdom of heaven by the last sentence of the supreme Judge may for a time be separated by ecclesiastical discipline from the sacrament of the heavenly bread."[1] Again:—"We may not prohibit any one from communion (although this prohibition is not yet for death, but for remedy), unless they have either confessed of their own accord, or been accused and convicted in some court, either secular, or ecclesiastical."[2] The author of the work on the Sacraments, formerly ascribed to S. Ambrose:—"Receive daily that which may daily profit thee. So live that thou mayest daily deserve to receive. *He who does not deserve to receive daily, does not deserve to receive at the year's end.* . . . Thou hearest, then, that so often as the sacrifice is offered, the death of the Lord, the resurrection of the Lord, the lifting up of the Lord, and remission of sins are signified,—and dost thou not take daily that bread of life?—He who has a wound seeks medicine. There is a wound, for we are under sin. The heavenly and venerable sacrament is the medicine."[3] Eusebius of Alexandria, who seems to have written in the fifth century, has been already cited:[4]—"If thou hast a pure conscience,

[1] Serm. cccli. de Util. Pœnit. § 7; tom. v. P. ii. col. 2011.

[2] Ibid. § 10; col. 2015.

[3] De Sacram. l. v. c. iv.; inter Opp. Ambr. tom. v. p. 239.

[4] See p. 36. The words rendered *wicked and flagitious* are πονηροῖς καὶ ἀτόποις. They are employed together by S. Paul (2 Thess. iii. 2) to

draw near and partake of the Body and Blood. But if thy conscience condemn thee of wicked and flagitious actions, decline the communion till thou hast corrected it through repentance"; *i.e.*, through penance. Gennadius of Marseilles, A.D. 495:—"A daily reception of the Eucharist I neither praise nor blame. Nevertheless, I advise and exhort to communion every Lord's day; provided the mind be free from sinful affection; for I say that one who has still the will to sin is rather hurt than cleansed by receiving the Eucharist. Therefore, *though a man have remorse for sin*, if his will is not to sin for the future, let him, when about to communicate, make amends by tears and prayers, and trusting in the mercy of the Lord, who is wont to pardon sin on a devout confession, let him come to the Eucharist free from fear and anxiety."[1] Isidore of Seville, more

describe men without faith, who opposed him and the Gospel. The class of crimes to which ἀτόποις applies may be inferred from S. Polycarp (ad Philipp. c. v. PP. Apostol. tom. ii. p. 476. Oxon. 1838):—Οὔτε πόρνοι, οὔτε μαλακοὶ, οὔτε ἀρσενοκοῖται, βασιλείαν Θεοῦ κληρονομήσουσιν (1 Cor. vi. 9), οὔτε οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ ἄτοπα; where Dr. Jacobson quotes Hesych. Ἄτοπα· πονηρὰ, αἰσχρά. I mention this because I am told that much reliance is placed on this passage of Eusebius, as a witness to the views put forth by Mr. Wilberforce;—as if he sanctioned abstinence from communion for less than *deadly* sin. If those who quote him in this sense have really considered his language, they must, apparently, suppose him to be dealing with the two several cases of those guilty of πονηρά, and those guilty of ἄτοπα, and understand by ἄτοπα mere *follies*, *irregularities*, or minor *inconsistencies*,—a meaning which it evidently does not bear.

[1] De Dogm. Eccl. c. liii.; in the collection of Cigheri, tom. ii. p. 163. Flor. 1791.

than a century later :—" He that eateth unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself; for *this is to receive unworthily, if one receive at a time when he ought to be doing penance.* But if his sins are not so great that he is deemed worthy of excommunication, he ought not to cut himself off from the medicine of Christ's Body. . . . He who has now ceased to sin should not forbear to communicate."[1] The words of Isidore are adopted by Rabanus Maurus,[2] Archbishop of Mayence in the ninth century. Walafridus Strabo, a contemporary of Rabanus, says to the same effect :—" When more grievous stains of mind or body do not stand in the way, let us seek without intermission the Bread and the Blood of the Lord, without which we cannot live; and let us take them rather with a desire of His protection, than a presumption of our own purity."[3] The third Council of Tours, in the same century, directs that " laymen shall communicate thrice in the year at least, if not oftener, unless prevented by any greater crimes."[4] Much later still, the Greek Canonist *Z*onaras, commenting on the decree of Antioch, A.D. 341, by which persons were condemned who came to Church, but " turned away from the holy reception of the Eucharist in a disorderly manner," says that it was directed against

[1] De Eccl. Off. l. i. c. 18; in Hittorp. p. 7.

[2] De Instit. Cler. l. i. c. 32. Hittorp. p. 327.

[3] De Reb. Eccl. c. xx. Hittorp. p. 405.

[4] Conc. Turon. A.D. 813, can. i. Labb. tom. vii. col. 1269. Grat. P. iii. Dist. ii. can. xvi. *Et si non frequentius.*

those who shrunk from receiving "out of reverence, it might be, and, as it were, from humility." His reason is that any worse feeling would deserve a greater punishment than that awarded.[1]

It is quite clear from the above extracts that, for a long period, only some "greater crime," for which a public penance was thought the proper remedy, or at the most a wilful persistence in less serious sin, was allowed as a sufficient reason for abstaining from the Table of the Lord. There was no difference in this respect between Eusebius, who advised the conscience-stricken sinner to remain without partaking, and S. Chrysostom, who bade him "not be present." All who believed themselves penitent and free from sinful affection were expressly told that they *ought* to communicate. Writers who held such language as this might have allowed the plea of a mind preoccupied by grief, or by necessary business, as an excuse for occasional absence from Church, especially when (as in the case which we have seen considered by S. Augustine) there was a daily administration of the Sacrament; but they could not have understood, much less would they have undertaken to justify, the conduct of one who, though free from gross sin, and actually present and able to give a devout attention[2]

[1] In can. Antioch. ii. Pand. tom. i. p. 432.

[2] This is supposed by Mr. Wilberforce:—"The greatest benefit which, according to the ancient writers (*what* ancient writers?), is attained by individuals through participation in the Eucharistic sacrifice, is the acceptableness which it confers upon their prayers. Not only are *their*

to every part of the holy office, should, notwithstanding, decline to join in that which is its chief and crowning act. Such persons they declared bound to receive. The only one [1] who advises the presence of non-communicants does not contemplate their case; but assumes that none will be non-communicants, who are not great sinners. It is obvious, however, that many who would not confess themselves such might yet desire at times to avoid communicating; and it would soon be a question how to treat *them*. At Alexandria they would, of course, have been permitted to remain, but subject to the suspicion of grievous sin. S. Chrysostom told them that only penitents were non-communicants, and that if they did not receive, they ought to leave the Church with the penitents:—"Thou hearest the herald (*i.e.*, the deacon) standing and saying, 'As many as are in penitence, all depart.' As many as do not partake are in penitence. If thou art one of of those that are in penitence, thou oughtest not to partake; for he that partakes not is one of those who are in penitence. Why then does he say, 'Depart ye that are not qualified to pray,' whilst

emotions more intense, but their petitions are more efficacious. . . . It is a foretaste of the beatific vision," &c., p. 413. Similarly the anonymous writer of "The Right of All the Baptized to be Present," &c., pleading for the admission of "others than actual communicants," speaks of "the *devout* soul gazing thereby at Christ, whom the sacred elements represent, and reminding itself of the Body pierced and the Blood shed on Calvary." Pref. p. 3.

[1] Euseb. Alex. u. s. See note [4], p. 41.

thou hast the effrontery to stand still? But no! Thou art not of that number. *Thou art of the number of those who are qualified to partake*, and yet art indifferent about it, and regardest the matter as nothing. . . . Thou hast sung the hymn *(Holy, Holy, &c.)* with the rest. Thou hast declared thyself to be of the number of them that are worthy by not departing with them that are unworthy. Why stay, and yet not partake of the Table?—'I am unworthy,' thou wilt say. Then art thou also as unfit for that communion thou hast had in the prayers," *i.e.*, the prayers proper to the Eucharist.[1]

CHAP. I. SECT. VII.

VII. The disorder censured by S. Chrysostom had called for the authoritative interference of the Church a full century, it is most probable, before he wrote; for there are two canons in the Ante-Nicene, or Pseudo-Apostolical code, which bear directly on it. They will be found, as might be expected, in strict accordance with those Scriptural views which we have seen prevailing through several centuries with regard both to the nature of the Sacrament and fitness for its reception. The eighth directed that any clergyman who did not communicate when the Sacrament was administered, should be "suspended,"[2] unless he could

[1] Hom. iii. in Ep. ad Eph.; tom. xi. pp. 26, 27. I use here the Oxf. Tr. 1845, pp. 132-134. See note [1], p. 37.

[2] *ἀφοριζέσθω*. In the case of a layman this *ἀφορισμὸς* was a temporary abstention from the Eucharist; of a clergyman, suspension from the exercise of his functions. See Morinus de Pœnit. l. iv. c. iii.; p. 172. Antv. 1682.

show "reasonable" cause for the omission.[1] The ninth runs thus:—"All the faithful who come in and hear the Scriptures, but do not remain at the prayer, and the holy reception, must be suspended, as bringing disorder into the Church."[2] These canons would be explained to those for whose guidance they were intended by the traditional sentiment and custom of the cotemporary Church; but there is an ambiguity in the latter of them which presents a difficulty to those who are without that assistance. To "remain *at* the reception," does not necessarily mean to remain *for* it, and from this it has been argued that the canon merely obliged all who came to the service to stay to the end, whether they communicated or not. It therefore becomes our duty to inquire how it was understood by the Church itself. The earliest comment on its meaning is found in the second canon of the Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, the decrees of which form part of "The Code of the Universal Church." By this it was

Laymen so punished neither *offered*, nor partook:—"Peccata leviora sola oblationis *offerendæ* et participandæ abstentione (seu ἀφορισμῷ) puniebant." Ibid. c. iii. § 1.; p. 170.

[1] Pandect. Bevereg. tom. i. p. 5.

[2] Ibid. p. 6. Mr. Wilberforce, p. 408, says that "this is quoted by Bingham as though it ordered all who were present to receive *daily*." I have searched carefully, but cannot find that Bingham draws from it any inference as to a *daily* reception. Of course those who were present daily would receive daily; but then they were at liberty to stay away if they thought proper. Thus Espencæus, though affirming with Mr. Wilberforce that those present were not obliged to communicate, affirms equally that neither were they compelled to be present. De Publ. et Priv. Miss. Opp. p. 1226. Par. 1619.

provided that "all who entered the Church and heard the sacred Scriptures, but did not communicate with the people in prayer, *or* turned away from the holy reception of the Eucharist in a disorderly manner, should be cast out of the Church."[1] It seems probable, from the use of the particle *or*, that at this period, some were accustomed to stay, if not to the end, yet through some material part of the service, without partaking; whereas the earlier canon, in condemning those who did not remain at the prayer *and* the reception, seems to imply that the custom then was to take part in both, or in neither.[2] The latter decree has also been supposed by some to have been directed principally against the Quarto-decimans,[3] whose irregularity in the observance of

[1] Pand. Bev. tom. i. p. 431.

[2] By the *prayer* I of course understand the Eucharistic Office, called "the prayer of the faithful." There was a preliminary service, at which the catechumens, penitents, and even the heathen were present, and in this they might have joined, though they did not "communicate with the people in prayer." See note [2], p. 31.

[3] So Schelstrate De Conc. Antioch. Dissert. iv. Can. ii. Schol. § 6, p. 179 (Antv. 1681), who is followed by Fleury, Hist. Eccl. l. xii. c. xii.; by Waterland, Review, c. xiv.; vol. iv. p. 786; &c. This, however, is little more than *conjecture;* though Mr. Wilberforce (p. 410) speaks of it as if it were a matter of perfect certainty:—"This Antiochene canon is not the expression of a general principle, or designed to guard against any separation of the sacrifice from the Sacrament, but it is merely a local injunction, founded on the prevalence of a particular heresy." It is possible that it had regard, in the first instance, to a custom of those who followed a particular heresy; but Mr. Wilberforce has no more right to assert it in this positive manner than he would have to affirm the contrary. I must say too that it is, at least, singular to stigmatize this canon as "merely a local injunction." Whether it primarily concerned the Quarto-decimans or not, it was of universal application, and was, in truth, adopted by the

Easter is condemned in the canon which immediately precedes it. It is probable too that the offence, of which the Fathers of Antioch complain, did not consist in simply turning away from the Sacrament. Perhaps they do not mean that such a proceeding was in itself disorderly; but that those whom they censure did it "in a disorderly manner," as if in contempt of the Church, or of the officiating clergy;—for it is not unlikely that at this time, as we know to have been the case somewhat later, those who did not wish to communicate might be at liberty to leave the Church before the office began, provided they did so in a quiet and orderly manner. These considerations, however, do not affect *our* point; and I only refer to them, because a different representation has been made by Mr. Wilberforce and others. The part of the canon with which we are concerned is little more than a repetition of the Ante-Nicene rule, and therefore we are quite warranted in interpreting the ambiguous clause in that by the more clear language of the former. But "to turn away from the reception" must mean to decline to receive, whether the person so doing remained in the Church or not. The earlier canon, therefore, as explained by the later, obliged all who entered the Church, not only to remain to the end, but to communicate.

whole Church. Nor was it very necessary for Mr. Wilberforce to assure us that it was not "designed to guard against any separation of the sacrifice from the Sacrament,"—an impossible piece of caution, as no such notion had yet been broached.

If it should be said that, in this case, the layman was more hardly treated than the clergyman, as the latter was allowed to plead a "reasonable" excuse for not receiving,[1] the answer is very obvious. The clergy were obliged to be present at every service, while a layman who did not intend to communicate had the alternative of staying away. The laity were never required by canon to attend the week-day services, and the fear of having a wrong construction put on their absence would be removed, as soon as the Church declared that she preferred it to attendance without reception. Nor was it until the Council of Elvira, in or about the year 305, that a penalty was any where attached to their non-attendance on the Sunday, and, as that only inflicted suspension when the offence was repeated on three successive Sundays,[2] there could have been no practical hardship in their being required to communicate whenever present even then. It should be remembered also that by the fourth century, if not before, there was

[1] Sudden illness or excitement of any kind are suggested as reasonable excuses for a priest not communicating by the 11th Council of Toledo, A.D. 675:—"Cavendum ne horis illis atque temporibus quibus Domino psallitur vel sacrificatur, unicuique Divinis singulariter officiis insistenti perniciosa passio vel corporis quælibet invalitudo occurrat." To obviate such a risk, the Council ordered that, where circumstances permitted it, the officiating priest should always be attended by another, who could take his place, if he were obliged to break off from any such cause. c. xiv. Labb. tom. vi. col. 553.

[2] Can. xxi. Labb. tom. i. col. 973. Moreover, it only affected those who lived in towns, and therefore had a church at hand. This canon is mentioned by Hosius when proposing the eleventh canon of Sardica, A.D. 347; tom. ii. col. 637.

at least one public service every day in city Churches, and perhaps elsewhere, at which the holy Eucharist was not administered[1]; so that when the primitive fervour had abated, and the majority now shrank from a very frequent reception of the Sacrament, means were provided through which they might have communion with their brethren in prayer, without giving offence by departing from them when engaged in the highest act of Christian worship.

More direct evidence as to the meaning of the Apostolic canon is supplied by the Latin version of Dionysius Exiguus, which was published at the end of the fifth or the beginning of the sixth century.[2] This version, says Dupin, "was approved and received by the Church of Rome, according to the testimony of Cassiodorus, and by the Church of France and other Latin Churches, according to that of Hincmarus."[3]

[1] See Bingham, Book xiii. c. ix. sects. viii.-xiii., and the two following chapters. Mr. Freeman (Principles of Divine Service, ch. i. § ii. Oxf. 1855) maintains that such a service existed from the *earliest* ages. His reasons, however, do not appear conclusive. It must be supposed, of course, that Christian friends and neighbours would from the first often meet to read the Scriptures and sing psalms and hymns together; but I can see no trace during the first three centuries of any service provided by authority, and conducted by the Bishop or presbyter in the usual place of common worship, at which the holy Eucharist was not celebrated.

[2] See Bevereg. Annot. in Cann. App., p. 1. Pand. tom. ii.

[3] Nouv. Biblioth. Cent. vi. *Dionys. Exig.* Engl. Tr. vol. i. p. 549. Dubl. 1723. The readers of Mr. Wilberforce are likely to have a very inadequate notion of the authority of this version. He says:—"The conclusion which Bingham derives from this canon, and which he founds upon the Latin version of Dionysius Exiguus, is not borne out by the Greek original." P. 409. Was Mr. Wilberforce not aware that the version of Dionysius, whether exact or not, was the authoritative version of the Western Church?

It was necessarily, therefore, in accordance with the tradition, if not altogether with the practice, of the Western Church from the sixth century downwards. Dionysius, moreover, was thoroughly versed in the Greek writers,[1] and could not fail to know how the ambiguous clause in question was understood throughout the East. His testimony, therefore, is virtually the testimony of the whole Church. The following is his rendering of the canon :—" It is meet that all the faithful, who come into Church, and hear the Scriptures, but do not persevere in prayer, *nor receive the holy communion*, be deprived of communion, as bringing disorder into the Church." [2]

Later translators, or editors, bore witness to the same tradition, though by so doing they condemned the existing practice of the Church. In a manual of Church law compiled by Cresconius, an African Bishop of the ninth century, the version of Dionysius is given without the slightest alteration.[3] The translation, or rather paraphrase of Regino, A.D. 892, condemns those who " enter the Church on the Lord's day, and hear the Scriptures of the Apostles, and the Gospel, but do not persevere in prayer until the mass is completed, *nor receive the holy communion*." [4]

[1] See Dupin, u. s.

[2] Codex Cann. Eccl. p. 30. Lut. Par. 1628.

[3] Breviar. Canon. c. xii. Opp. Venant. Fortun. et Alior. col. 841. Par. 1850.

[4] De Discipl. Eccl. l. i. c. cxciii. sig. G 2. Helmæst. 1659.

In Burchard, A.D. 996,[1] and Ivo, 1092,[2] the canon speaks of those who "meet at Church on the sacred festivals," but the disputed clause is given in the very words employed by Dionysius and Regino. It is similarly expressed in Gratian, A.D. 1131.[3]

From the Latin Canonists, let us now turn to the Greek. By Zonaras, who flourished at the beginning of the twelfth century, we are told that the ninth Apostolical canon "requires all, during the performance of the holy sacrifice, to persevere to the end in prayer, and the holy reception;—for the laity," he adds, "were then required to *communicate* constantly."[4] Balsamon, nearly a century later, says:—"The decree of this canon is very severe; for it suspends those who come to Church but do not stay to the end, and do not *communicate*. But other canons decree

[1] Decret. l. ii. c. lxvii. fol. 58, fa. 2. Par. 1549.

[2] Decret. P. vi. c. 163. Opp. P. i. p. 211. Par. 1647. C. 164 is another version which omits the words "on the sacred festivals."

[3] P. iii. De Consecr. Dist. i. c. lxii. *Omnes fideles.*

[4] Comment. in Cann., p. 6. Par. 1618. Pand. Bever. tom. i. p. 6. Johnson (Vade Mecum, P. ii. p. 9. Ed. 3) says that both Balsamon and Zonaras are willing to make this canon speak the sense of their own degenerate age, viz., "that it was sufficient for men to stay in the Church, not necessary to partake of the communion." So in a letter ascribed to the late Dr. Mill (confessedly the result of "no very extensive search"), which was published in No. 7 of "Tracts on Christian Unity":—"With respect to the laity or such clergy as might be in the congregation, the practice, if they did not communicate, was rather to stay throughout the celebration to the end than to introduce disorder (ἀταξίαν) into the congregation, and show aversion from the communion by retiring before. So Balsamon and Zonaras interpret the 9th Apostolical canon as well as . . . the 2nd of the Council of Antioch," p. 2. We shall see presently how far this is true of Balsamon. Meanwhile, let me say that I can find no evidence whatever for the representation as it regards Zonaras.

similarly that all be prepared and fit to *receive*, and suspends those who do not *receive* for three Lord's days."[1] Balsamon's testimony to the received interpretation of the canon is the more valuable from his avowed dislike of it. He would fain have brought the stricter rules of the Ante-Nicene Church into accordance with the laxer practice of his own day. Thus elsewhere he explains the Apostolical canon by the Antiochene, insisting that it only condemned those who abstained "in a disorderly manner," *i.e.*, as he chose to understand it, "those who left the Church in a disorderly way from feelings of contempt and arrogance."[2] In the same spirit he tells us that some applied the eighth Apostolical canon to Bishops and priests only, and to such deacons as were actually engaged in the celebration, but that "some thought that every person in holy orders, who did not partake, was suspended by the canon"; which, however, he considers, "very burdensome."[3] In his answer to some questions on various matters of ritual put to him by Mark II. of Alexandria, he goes still further, and adopts a similar relaxation of the ninth canon:— "Though some desire, by means of this canon, to oblige those who come to Church, to receive the Divine Sacraments even against their will, yet we do not interpret the canon thus; for we decide that

[1] Pandect. Bev. tom. i. p. 6.

[2] Comment. in can. Antioch. ii. Pand. tom. i. p. 431.

[3] Pand. tom. i. p. 5.

the faithful are to stay in Church to the end of the Divine sacrifice, and the concluding prayer of the celebrant, and the reception of the *Antidoron;* and we hold the threat of the canon over those who fail to do this; but we do not force them to communicate."[1] It must not be supposed, however, that Balsamon varied in his opinion of the *literal* meaning, or ancient interpretation, of the canon. He is merely telling his correspondent how he enforced the discipline of his age by an appeal to the early rule, without denying that it had been framed to guard a different practice. I infer this from what he says elsewhere of the origin of the *Antidoron*. This was a piece of bread, blessed with a special prayer, and given as a *substitute* for the Sacrament to those who did not communicate. "Its distribution," he says, "was thought of, as it seems, on account of the threat in the eighth and ninth Apostolical canon, and the second Antiochene; so that even they who are not able to partake of the undefiled mysteries stay of necessity until the prayer and the dismissal,

[1] Resp. xvi. ad Marc. Alex. in Jure Græco-Rom. l. v. p. 371. Francof. 1596. Another Greek canonist of unknown age and name, whose gloss is added in the MSS. to that of Balsamon, cuts the knot with more decision:—"That we all, the lay faithful and those in orders who do not handle the holy things, ought to partake daily of the Sacraments, or if not, to be suspended, is neither the sense of the canon, nor is it a thing possible." Pand. tom. i. p. 6. He therefore says openly that the eighth and ninth Apostolical canons were only intended to oblige all who came to Church "to stay until the holy Communion had been received by the worthy." His stumbling-block was the false assumption that those canons contemplated a *daily* service (including Communion), at which all were *obliged* to be present.

to receive the blessing of the consecrated piece from the hand of the officiating priest."[1] It appears evident from this that Balsamon did not mean to deny the traditional interpretation of the ambiguous clause in the ninth Apostolical canon. But he thought it "very severe and burdensome," and was therefore led to sanction a new application of the old rule. In other words, he consented to accept a reception of the *Antidoron*, as a sufficient observance of the law, from those who could not be persuaded to communicate.

This custom of giving the *Antidoron* after the celebration, to those who did not communicate, may be traced with certainty as high as the ninth century.[2]

[1] Pandect. tom. i. p. 431.

[2] I believe this practice, *i.e.*, the use of bread blessed by the priest as a *substitute* for the Sacrament, to have been introduced later than is generally supposed. The earliest certain notice of the *Antidoron*, if I mistake not, is by Hincmar, in some Capitula which he drew up for the direction of his clergy, A.D. 852, cap. vi. Opp. tom. i. p. 711. Par. 1645. Another mention of it, belonging to the same period, occurs in one of the canons ascribed to a Council of Nantes, and published by Labbé and Mansi among those of the end of the ninth century. The canon in which it is found (No. ix. Labb. tom. ix. col. 470) is given by Regino, 892, as *ex Concilio Nannetensi* (l. i. c. cccxxix.); but they are clearly only a compilation from various sources. See Dupin, Cent. ix. ch. xi.; vol. ii. p. 119. Nantes was in ruins at this time. Pagi in Mansi, tom. xi. col. 61. St. Augustine is often quoted as alluding to the practice (De Pecc. Mer. et Rem. l. ii. § 42); but his allusion is to the salt given to catechumens. See Bona, Rer. Liturg. l. ii. c. xix. § vii.; p. 371. Other early authorities frequently cited as witnessing to it are speaking either of the custom of giving or sending pieces of bread that had been blessed (at one period of that which had been consecrated in the Eucharist) as a token of communion and Christian love (*e.g.*, Conc. Laodic. cann. xiv. xxxii.: Greg. Naz. Orat. xix.: August. ad Alyp. Ep. xxv.: Paulin. ad August. Ep. xxxi. inter epp. Aug.: Greg. Turon. Hist. Franc. l. vi. c. v.; l. viii. c. ii.: Conc. Aquisgr. can. lxviii. [in Capitul. Reg. Franc. tom. i. col. 587]: &c.), or of the distribution among the clergy and others of the bread and wine which had

At that period, then, the primitive interpretation of the Apostolical canon must have still generally prevailed; for, unless Balsamon is mistaken as to the motive of the rite, it was, to speak plainly, only an acted subterfuge, a Jesuitical expedient, by which men sought to satisfy their consciences, while they were disobeying what they confessed to be the rule and order of the Church.

CHAP. I. SECT. VIII.

VIII. It has been already shown that the mediæval canonists of the Latin Church exhibited the ancient rule in their collections in such a form as to put the sense in which they understood it beyond the question of a doubt. We shall now see that the primitive practice was equally well known to a wide range of ritualists and other writers in the West during the same lengthened period. Thus in "Micrologus," a work on ritual, belonging to an uncertain author of the eleventh century, we are told that "according to the ancient Fathers, only those who communicated were wont to be present at the Divine mysteries; whence also it arose, that before the oblation, the catechumens and penitents,—to wit, those who had not yet prepared themselves to communicate, were ordered to go out. Which is also intimated in the

been offered for the use of the Sacrament, but not consecrated; to which see reference in Socrat. Hist. Eccles. l. vii. c. xii.: Theophil. Alex. can. vii. (in Bever. Pandect. tom. ii. p. 172): &c. For an account of the strange development of this rite among the later Orientals, see Covell's Greek Church, ch. iii. p. 88. Camb. 1722.

form of celebrating the Sacrament, in which the priest prays not for his own offering and communion alone, but for those of others,—and above all in the prayer after communion he seems to pray only for persons communicating."[1] "'This at least,' says the anonymous author of Tours in his MS. Speculum, 'ought not to be unknown, that every day of old, in the primitive Church, those who were present at the canon of the mass were wont to communicate.' . . . In much the same manner speaks John Beleth in his Book of Divine Offices, c. 120:—'In the primitive Church it was ordered that every day the Body of the Lord should be received'; . . . in which words," remarks Martene, "he asserts . . . that all the faithful assisting at the mass were daily partakers of the Body and Blood of the Lord."[2] "In the first Church," says Peter of Blois, Archdeacon of Bath, 1160, "as many as were present at the consecration of the Eucharist used to communicate in the same."[3] So an unknown writer on the Divine Offices, from whom Cassander gives an extract:—"In the primitive Church as many as were at the consecration of the Eucharist communicated."[4] Hugo De S. Charo, A.D. 1245:—"In the primitive Church all, as many as were at the canon of the mass, communicated

[1] De Eccles. Observ. c. li. Hittorp. p. 460.
[2] De Antiq. Eccl. Ritibus, tom. i. p. 154. Antv. 1763.
[3] Serm. xvi. Opp. p. 354. Mogunt. 1600.
[4] Liturgica, c. xxx. Opp. p. 71. Par. 1616.

every day, and if they did not wish to communicate, they went out after the offertory ; to wit, after the mass of the catechumens."[1] Durant, the ritualist, 1285 :—"In the primitive Church all who were present at the celebration of masses used to communicate every day ; forasmuch as the Apostles *all* drank of the cup, the Lord saying, Drink ye *all* of this."[2] Ralph De Rivo, Dean of Tongres, A.D. 1390, says :—"All *ought* to communicate," and shows that the prayers in the office are for the communicants alone.[3] Aquinas :—"In the primitive Church it was ordained that the faithful should communicate daily."[4] De Lyra :—"In the primitive Church not only the ministers of the Church took this Sacrament, but the whole people daily."[5] And the Ecstatic Doctor :—"In the primitive Church . . . daily communion was prescribed to the faithful."[6] Statements such as the last three imply, as Martene has pointed out, that only those who communicated were permitted to be present. It is similarly implied that all present received in such statements as the following from the Gemma Animæ, A.D. 1130 :—"It is said

[1] Comment in S. Luc. Ev. c. xxiv. ad id *Pax vobis ;* Comm. tom. vi. fol. 275, fa. 2. Venet. 1600.

[2] Ration. Div. Off. l. iv. c. liii. fol. 201, fa. 2. Antv. 1570.

[3] De Canonum Observ. Prop. xxiii. Ferrar. pp. 673, 674.

[4] Summ. P. iii. Q. lxxx. Art. x. ad 5^{m}, p. 184. Colon. 1604.

[5] In Luc. xv. ad id *Et manducemus.* Bibl. cum glossis, P. v. fol. 165, fa. 2. Bas. 1501-2.

[6] Dionys. Carthns. in Lib. iv. Sent. Dist. ix. Q. 1, p. 110. Colon. 1535.

that formerly the priests used to receive flour from every house or family (which the Greeks observe still), and made the Lord's bread of it, which they offered for the people, and *distributed to them* after consecration. For every one of those who offered the flour was present at the mass, and for them it was said in the canon:—'And of all standing around, who offer to thee this sacrifice of praise.' But after the Church increased indeed in numbers, but fell off in sanctity, it was decreed, because of the carnal, that they who could should *communicate* every Lord's day, or on the Lord's day, or at the chief festivals, or thrice in the year." [1]

The confession of Clichtovæus and Cochlæus, two of the most ardent opponents of the reforming movement in Germany, will show that the fact was in their time supposed to be too well established to admit of question even from those who would have rejoiced, had they been able, to think otherwise. By the former of these we are told that "the rite according to which the celebrating priest delivers the sacrament of the Eucharist to the assisting laity, as often as he celebrates the mysteries, is ancient, and agreeable to the custom of the primitive Church in which the faithful daily received the communion of the Eucharist, according to that decree of Pope Calixtus:—'The consecration being over, let all

[1] C. 58; in Ferrar. p. 695.

communicate,'"[1] &c. Cochlæus says:—"The reason why masses were not so frequent formerly, nor priests so numerous, I take to be this;—that formerly all, both priests and laity, whosoever were present at the sacrifice of the mass, when the oblation was finished, used to communicate with the sacrificing priest. . . . But now, as that custom of communicating is no longer observed among us, through the sloth and negligence, not less of the laity, than of the priests, the Holy Ghost has found out and introduced a pious compensation for this negligence in the frequent use of masses which the priest performs alone."[2]

The excellent Cassander, who lived for three or four years after the lawfulness of private masses was finally affirmed, and the practice sanctioned by the Council of Trent, will fitly close this series of testimonies:—"In this public action the custom long obtained of distributing the Eucharist of the Lord's Body and Blood to all present. For at this mystic action and consecration only the faithful, and

[1] In Can. Missæ, quoted by Cassander, Liturg. c. xxx. Opp. p. 79. The sentence ascribed here to Calixtus (from Gratian, P. iii. Dist. ii. c. x. *Peracta*) is often quoted in this controversy. It is taken, however, from one of the Forged Decretals (Anacleti Ep. i.), and moreover, though it appears when read by itself to concern the laity, as well as clergy, the context in the Epistle from which it has been detached shows that it can refer to the ministrant clergy only; as may be seen from a longer extract in Gratian, P. iii. D. i. c. lix. *Episcopus*.

[2] Sacerdotii, &c., Defens. c. iii. fol. 58, fa. 2. Par. 1545. Similarly in c. i. fol. 15, fa. 2, he says that "it was permitted to no one to be present at the celebration who was not a partaker of the sacred communion."

those fit to communicate, were present, who were wont to offer both bread and wine for the use of the mystery, and religiously partook of the same when consecrated; the catechumens, penitents, energumens, and the other non-communicants being dismissed by the proclamation of the deacon, and shut out." [1]

CHAP. I. SECT. IX.

IX. It is obvious that the course taken by the Church of Rome at Trent, with regard to private masses, has subjected her learned members to a temptation to deceive themselves upon the point into which we have been inquiring. I find accordingly that many late writers of that communion deny that the holy Eucharist was received by all present in the first ages of the Church;—though they do not appear to have any positive reason for their denial, but rest it solely upon grounds of theory and conjecture. There are many, however, who, to their honour, have not shrunk from the avowal of a truth, which it was so much their interest, as controversialists, to hide. As their testimony to the early practice derives a peculiar weight from their position, I will adduce it briefly in their own words; though I am sensible that I shall be only accumulating evidence in proof of a point already beyond dispute.

Cardinal Bona asserts that in the infancy of the Church "no one was permitted to be present at the

[1] Præf. in Ord. Rom. Opp. p. 94. Sim. Liturgica, c. xxvi. p. 55; Consult. de Solit. Miss. p. 996.

sacred mysteries, but those who were able to offer, and to partake of the things offered;—which custom," he adds, "evidently continued a long time."[1] The truth of his statement is acknowledged by his editor, the learned Sala.[2] Mabillon is another illustrious witness on the same side; for we find him expressing an opinion that a warning to non-communicants to quit the Church, mentioned by Gregory I. in a passage that will be cited hereafter, is "to be understood not only of penitents, but also of *any other* persons who did not communicate."[3] Schelstrate repeats and assents to the statements of Bona; though afterwards, in describing himself the practice of the first Christians, he inserts a qualifying clause:—"All the faithful used to communicate in prayer, as if with one soul, at the time of the sacrifice, nor did any one go out, but all partook of the sacred communion, or if for any reason they abstained once or twice they remained in the Church, praying to the Lord, to the end of the sacrifice."[4] There was a period of which this account may be admitted to be exactly true; but he should have acknowledged that, when the Church interfered by a canon, she forbad the presence of those who did not intend to communicate.

[1] Rer. Liturg. l. ii. c. xvii. § ii.; p. 361. Sim. l. i. c. xiii. § ii.

[2] See his notes on l. i. c. xiii. § ii. Bonæ Opp. tom. i. p. 265. Aug. Taurin. 1747. He quotes Beleth, and draws the same inference with Martene, *fideles omnes Missæ assistentes quotidie communicasse.*

[3] Liturg. Gallic. l. i. c. iv. § xiv.; p. 35. Par. 1685. See p. 75.

[4] De Conc. Antioch. Diss. iv. c. vii. § 3; p. 223.

Dupin's view of the matter may be collected from his account of the notices of it, which are found in the writings of Cassander:—"He *shows* that it was long the custom of the Church to distribute the Body and Blood of Christ to all assistants." "He thinks that, *since formerly no men assisted at the mass who did not communicate*, all men that now assist ought to be in a condition to offer sacrifice with the priest, and to participate in the Divine Sacraments, either by actually receiving, or at least by a religious desire."[1] Van Espen has much upon the subject:—"It is certain that originally the mass was so instituted, and all the prayers so ordered, that not the priest only, but the bystanders also are supposed to communicate; nay, anciently none hardly but the communicants were allowed to be present."[2] Elsewhere, when speaking of the *earliest* period, he says, without any limitation, and adopting in part the words of Bona:—"It is certain, and a proved fact, that in the infancy of the Church all the faithful, who were of one heart and one soul, continued daily in communicating and breaking of bread, nor was any one permitted to be present at the sacred mysteries, except such as were able to offer and to partake of the things offered."[3] Martene has been already cited[4]

[1] Nouv. Biblioth. Cent. xvi. *Cassander.* Eng. Tr. vol. iii. pp. 700, 707.

[2] Jus Eccles. P. ii. sect. i. tit. v. c. iii. § iv. Opp. tom. i. p. 416. Lov. 1753.

[3] Schol. in Cann. Apost.; can. x.; tom. iii. p. 49.

[4] See note [2], p. 58.

as inferring from a statement of John Beleth that "all the faithful assisting at the mass were daily partakers of the Body and Blood of the Lord." He is not content with this; but proceeds to establish his conclusion by reference to ancient canons and other testimonies. Cigheri:—"When the peace of the Church was restored and the love of the faithful waxed a little cold, even then, if any did not communicate as often as they assembled, it was accounted a crime."[1] It should be mentioned that Bona, Van Espen, Martene, and Cigheri, all quote the Apostolical canon as bearing witness to their statements. To these testimonies of Roman Catholic writers we will add that of Mr. Maskell, though written before his unhappy secession to their communion:—"It is so well known that, during the first five centuries at least, the universal practice was to allow no one to be present except communicants, and the last class of penitents, that it would be a waste of space and time to repeat authorities which have been cited over and over again." After referring the reader to Bona and Bingham, he adds:—"I pass on thus briefly only because the fact of the practice of the earliest ages of the Church is both so certain and so generally owned; and not because it is of little importance in the decision which we ought to come to in this matter; for, on the contrary, it is not simply of importance, but in all doubtful matters

[1] De Dogm. Eccl. P. ii. tract. iv. prol. § 34; tom. ix. p. 273.

of obligation, both by the decision of the Church of England herself, and by the united testimony of her best divines. So that even allowing that there was no more to say, we should already have learned enough, having discovered the rule that governed the first five centuries."[1]

[1] Ancient Liturgy, Pref. ch. v.; p. lxxix. Ed. 1846.

CHAPTER II.

AUTHORIZED DEPARTURE FROM THE PRIMITIVE RULE. CONSEQUENT INFREQUENCY OF RECEPTION BY THE LAITY. RISE OF PRIVATE MASSES. GROUNDS ON WHICH THEY WERE DEFENDED. STATE OF THINGS AT THE TIME OF THE REFORMATION.

CHAP. II.

It has been shown in the last chapter, by the concurrent testimony of the primitive and of the mediæval Church, confirmed by the less willing witness of Roman Catholic divines, that during the first ages all present at the celebration of the holy Eucharist were under obligation to communicate. We have also seen that such a rule and practice are in accordance with the intent and nature of the Sacrament, whether as prefigured in the law, or more plainly taught us in the Gospel, and with the opinions that are known to have prevailed, both on that subject and on due fitness for reception, among the early doctors of the Church. I now proceed to a brief sketch of the several changes that took place, and the varieties of practice that obtained in western Christendom, from the first deviation from the primitive rule down to the middle of the sixteenth century, when the full-blown result of ages of corruption was formally adopted and

established in the twenty-second session of the Council of Trent.

CHAP. II. SECT. I.

I. By the latter part of the fourth century, it had evidently become impossible to enforce a strict observance of the Apostolic rule, and opinions differed as to the best course to be then taken. At Alexandria, as we have said, the laity who did not communicate had long been *permitted*, as a century or less later they were *encouraged*, to remain till the dismissal.[1] But the more general custom was for them to leave before the communion. Whether they *ever* left with the penitents, — the course indignantly suggested by S. Chrysostom to some whom he found staying without receiving,—may be thought doubtful. The reasons which made this course distasteful at an earlier period would still exist; though the growing laxity of the age must have impaired, in some degree, their force. It should be remembered, too, that a much longer service was now in use, which gave them a suitable opportunity of withdrawing somewhat later than the penitents. There was, in fact, a considerable interval between the departure of the latter and the offertory, which was employed in secret supplication, and in praying, at the dictation of the deacon, for the world and the Church, in a form which was the original of our Prayer for the

[1] See p. 35. From the course which custom took at Alexandria, I should doubt if the Apostolical canon were ever enforced there.

Church Militant.[1] The conclusion of this, as it was immediately followed by the kiss of peace and other preparations for communion, was clearly a very proper time for non-communicants to withdraw. There is, notwithstanding, unless I am much deceived, no evidence to show that they any where took advantage of this opportunity. The only notice of the time of their leaving with which I am acquainted occurs in a homily of S. Cæsarius, and he says most distinctly that they "went out of the Church after the reading of the lessons,"[2] *i.e.*, *before* the time appointed for the withdrawal of

[1] The Council of Laodicæa (most probably, A.D. 365) orders that after the sermon by the Bishop shall be said the prayer for the catechumens, and when they have withdrawn, that for the penitents, and that after the latter have received imposition of hands, and departed, the three prayers of the faithful shall be said, "the first secretly (διὰ σιωπῆς), the second and third at bidding, and that then the kiss of peace shall be given." Can. xix. Pand. Bever. tom. i. p. 461. A form of bidding prayer (so called because dictated to the people by the deacon) occurs in the Apostolical Constitutions, l. viii. cc. ix. x., and is given at length by Bingham, b. xv. ch. i. sect. ii.; vol. i. p. 727. It is worthy of remark that these prayers, though part of the Office of Holy Communion, were used in the daily morning service, *even when there was no communion*. Bingham, b. xiii. ch. x. sect. iv. p. 647. I mention this, because it gives a sanction to the similar practice of the Church of England, condemned by Mr. Wilberforce (p. 380) and others in language with which I could not sympathize, even if that practice had been without a precedent.

[2] Hom. xii. in Biblioth. PP. tom. ii. col. 291. Par. 1624. As it is not likely that they would be willing to lose the sermon, their leaving after the lessons seems to imply that the *general* practice of the French Church at this period was to omit the sermon, which should have followed the lessons. There is reason to believe that at Rome, both before and after the time of Cæsarius, there was no preaching. "There," says Sozomen, "neither the Bishop, nor any other teaches in Church." Hist. Eccl. l. vii. c. xix.; p. 596. Cassiodorus, who had lived at Rome (A.D. 514), says the same thing. See Valois, notes to Sozom. u.s. p. 123. Par. 1686.

the catechumens, and with the unbelievers, if any such happened to be present. The precise point at which they left is, however, of less importance; the fact is certain, that from the fourth century downwards it was a very common thing for persons in full communion to depart before the distribution of the consecrated elements. We gather from S. Chrysostom that, during one part of his ministry at least, this was the custom of the great majority of his hearers:—"I have grieved exceedingly," he tells them, "because, when I your fellow-servant am preaching, great is the zeal, intense the eagerness of the people, who crowd one on another, and stay to the end; but when Christ is about to appear in the sacred mysteries, the Church becomes empty and deserted."[1] In an ancient homily, formerly ascribed to this Father, we find the usual warnings to leave the Church, given by the deacon to the catechumens and others, amplified and paraphrased in such a manner as to show that they included all who, *for whatever reason*, did not communicate:—"Let not any one of the catechumens (be present), not any one of those who do not eat, not of the gazers (or spies), not of those who are not able to look on the calf that is eaten, not of those who are not able to look upon the heavenly Blood that is shed for the remission of sins; let not any one who is unworthy of the living sacrifice, let not any one who is un-

[1] De Incompr. Dei. Nat. Hom. iii.; tom. i. p. 573.

initiated, any one who is not able, with unclean lips, to touch the dread mysteries."[1]

CHAP. II. SECT. II.

II. In the former half of the sixth century three Councils held in France, the first at Agde, and the two others at Orleans, ordained that none should leave the Church before they had received the Bishop's blessing[2]; by which some

[1] De Filio Prod. Hom., inter Opp. Chrys.; tom. viii. p. 655.

[2] Agde, A.D. 506, can. xlvii. :—"We enjoin by a special ordinance that masses on the Lord's day be observed entire by the laity; in such manner that the people presume not to go out of the church before the sacerdotal blessing." Labb. tom. iv. col. 1391. Orleans I., A.D. 511, can. xxvi. :—"When there is an assembling in the name of God for the celebration of masses, let not the people depart before the solemnity of the mass be completed; and when a Bishop shall be there, let them receive the sacerdotal blessing." Ibid. col. 1408. This extended the rule to *all* masses. The Canon of Agde having provided for those only which were celebrated on Sunday. Orleans III., A.D. 538, can. xxix. :—"Let none of the laity depart from masses before the Lord's Prayer be said, and if the Bishop shall be present, let his blessing be waited for." Tom. v. col. 302. By a *mass* in this canon (and probably in the preceding) we must understand (as appears from the context, which speaks of "the sacrifices of morning and *evening* masses,") *any* assembly for public worship; in which general sense the word was sometimes used. See Bona, Rer. Liturg. l. i. c. ii. § iv. p. 199. In some churches the daily morning and evening service ended with the Lord's Prayer. Bingham, b. xiii. ch. xi. sect. vii.; vol. i. p. 656. But the canon *includes*, of course, in its provision, the morning services on Festivals, when the Communion was celebrated. It ruled, therefore, that at such times the people should remain till after the consecration, for that was immediately followed by the Lord's Prayer. We are thus enabled to fix the point at which the non-communicants were expected to depart, viz., between the consecration and the communion. At this time there was no blessing, properly so called, at the end of the Communion Office, though at a later period the final prayer for the people came to be styled so, perhaps solely from a misunderstanding of the above-cited canons. Thus Walafrid Strabo :—"It was decreed by the Council of Orleans that the people should not go out from the mass before the sacerdotal blessing, which blessing is understood to be the last prayer of the priest." De Reb. Eccl. c. 22. Hittorp. p. 410. In the time of the councils, the word *sacerdos* meant a *bishop:* in the time of Strabo, a *priest;* whence his mistake.

writers have been led to think that all were then *obliged* to stay throughout the entire service. This opinion is, however, inconsistent with the language of Strabo [1]; and an explanation of the decree has been given by Mabillon and others, which is perfectly satisfactory on independent grounds. The last of those Councils, the third of Orleans, 538, ordered that "none of the laity should depart from mass *before the Lord's Prayer was said*, and that if the Bishop were present they should wait for his blessing." The order that they should not leave before the Lord's Prayer actually implies that they were still to leave some time before the conclusion of the service; nor does the other provision of the canon intend that that custom was to be broken when the Bishop happened to be

Later and more learned writers have been misled by the clause, *before the solemnity of the mass be completed*, used by the first Council of Orleans, and by the corresponding phrase in the canon of Agde, imagining that this must enforce attendance to the end of the whole service. It has been shown, however, by Mabillon and others, that the mass was spoken of as completed before the communion began. Thus Gregory of Tours in the same century :—"*The solemnities being finished*, he had approached the most holy altar in order to communicate." Hist. Franc. l. ix. c. iii. Opp. col. 420. Lut. Par. 1699. And again :—"*The masses being completed*, the people had begun to receive the most sacred Body of the Redeemer." De Mirac. Martini, l. ii. c. xlvii. col. 1069. Sim. S. Cyprian, De Lapsis (Tract. p. 132) :—"When, *the solemnities completed*, the deacon began to offer the cup to those present," &c. When this language became obsolete, the canons would appear to order all present to stay during the communion ;—especially after a blessing had been added at the end of the whole service :—and this mistake would greatly facilitate the general introduction of the custom.

[1] De Reb. Eccl. c. 22. Hittorp. p. 408. They could not have been obliged to stay till after the communion, for he speaks of those who "offered in masses *transeunter*"; that is, who left the Church, after presenting their offerings, before the *action* of the mass.

present; for the blessing of which it speaks was given before the communion, and immediately after the Lord's Prayer.[1] The remarks of Bona upon this subject are worth quoting:—"But you will say, 'It was lawful, then, to leave before the communion, the mass being not yet over!' It was so, clearly, if the customs of that age are attended to, in which all who were present at the mass communicated; for as many as were unable or unwilling to be partakers of the mysteries used to leave the Church at the end of the Canon,[2] before the Lord's Prayer was said (*i.e.* until the Councils ordered otherwise); for the remainder of the service belonged to the communion, to wit, that prayer itself, and the Bishop's blessing, and the kiss of peace,—a sort of preparation, that,

[1] Bona understands the canon of Agde to speak of the prayer at the end of the service, though he interprets both Councils of Orleans and the passage of Cæsarius of the blessing before communion. Rer. Lit. l. ii. c. xvi. § iii. p. 357. There appears no real ground for the distinction, and it is highly improbable that the two later Councils,—one of them more than thirty years later,—should exhibit a nearer approach to the primitive discipline than the earlier. This inconsistency in Bona seems to have misled Bingham. "Cardinal Bona," he says, "understands this (the canon of Orleans III.) of the final benediction, which followed the communion." B. xv. ch. iii. sect. xxix.; vol. i. p. 765. He seems to have read no further than the remarks on the canon of Agde, and to have assumed that Bona understood all three in the same manner. Bingham, in his turn, has been misunderstood by Waterland, who *implies* that he supposed the Council of Agde and the first of Orleans to order non-communicants to stay throughout. Review, ch. xiv.; vol. iv. p. 792. The sentence which he quotes from the Antiquities (u. s. ch. iv. sect. ii. p. 770) is not quite clear; but the sense in which he takes it is opposed to the drift of the whole context, and to the author's opinion elsewhere expressed.

[2] I do not know on what authority he makes this statement; and it is certainly at variance with the custom in France at the beginning of the sixth century. See p. 69.

cleansed by these things, they might approach God's Table with greater purity."[1] Cæsarius, Bishop of Arles from 501 to 543, presided at Agde, the earliest of the three Councils to which I have referred,[2] and it so happens that two of his extant sermons are upon the duty of staying till the Bishop gave his blessing. In one of these he says :—"He who would celebrate mass completely, with profit to his soul, ought to continue in Church . . . until the Lord's Prayer be said, and the blessing given to the people."[3] The other shows distinctly that it was the consecration and not the communion at which he urged them to be present; for he entreats them to stay "until the food of souls be *placed* on that spiritual table and the spiritual Sacraments are *consecrated*. And because," he adds, "after the Lord's Prayer a blessing is given you, not by man, but through man, . . . receive the dew of the Divine blessing."[4]

[1] Rer. Liturg. l. ii. c. xvi. § iii.; p. 358.

[2] See Labb. tom. iv. col. 1394.

[3] Hom. xii. as before, note [2], p. 69.

[4] Hom. viii. in the later collection, edited from MS. by Baluze. Par. 1669. The use of the Lord's Prayer after the consecration may be traced much higher than the age of Cæsarius. S. Augustine (Ad Paulin. Ep. cxlix. § 16; tom. ii. col. 761) says that after the blessing and consecration of the elements, and the division of the bread for distribution, "nearly all the Church concluded the petition with the Lord's Prayer." It does not appear in the Clementine or Ethiopian Liturgies; in those of S. James, S. Mark, and Chrysostom, it comes between the consecration and division; in the two ascribed to Basil, after both. This was probably its place in all the Latin Liturgies. In all which have it, of those named, it is followed very closely, in some immediately, by the blessing, *Peace be with you*. There can be no doubt of this having been the origin of those longer forms which were in use in the West from the sixth century down-

That the custom of leaving before the communion lasted throughout this century is evident from a passage in the writings of Gregory I., who lived into the next. He tells a strange story of two nuns, who in their lifetime had been threatened with excommunication if they did not learn to bridle their tongue, being often seen after their death to rise up in the Church in which they had been buried, and go out when the deacon proclaimed, "Let those who do not communicate give place."[1] As they had not been excommunicated, we must infer that it was the Roman custom in Gregory's time for those who felt themselves unprepared to receive on any occasion to leave, as these women are said to have done, before the communion. Another of his stories confirms this inference. Relating a scene that took place immediately before the death of a Bishop named Cassius in the presence of many persons, he says that "with his own hand he gave the Lord's Body and the Peace *to them all*."[2]

It is probable that in those Churches, in which a Bishop was generally present at holy communion, the non-communicants would continue for

wards, and which generally concluded with the words:—*The peace of the Lord be with you always.* Many examples have been published by Pamelius (Liturgicon, tom. ii. pp. 479—516. Colon. 1571), from whom Bona has borrowed some. Rer. Liturg. l. ii. c. xvi. § ii.; p. 357. A few are also given by Mr. Maskell, from a MS. Pontifical *Ad usum Sarum.* Ancient Liturgy, p. 198.

[1] Dial. ii. c. 23. Opp. tom. ii. col. 253. Par. 1705.

[2] In Evang. l. ii. Hom. xxxvii.; tom. i. col. 1633.

a lengthened period to regard his blessing as their dismissal. Elsewhere, as the time fixed for their departure was less marked, and the remainder of the service very short, they would naturally fall soon into a habit of staying to the end. I know nothing of the steps by which the latter custom gradually became general; but its progress was clearly rapid; for by the end of the eighth century it had already so gained ground as to be considered the more correct and fruitful mode of hearing mass. In the Capitulary of the French kings the following clause is added to the canon of the third Council of Orleans, already quoted:—"Nor let any one presume to go out before the mass is finished."[1] The compilers naturally assumed that the canon was in accordance with the custom of their day, and we may suppose that by this addition they merely intended to make it more clear to the sense in which they understood it.

[1] L. vii. c. cclxxvii. Capitul. Reg. Franc. tom. i. col. 1087. Par. 1677. The clause added is:—*Neque ante missam expletam quis egredi præsumat.* That at *this* period the words *missa expleta* meant the conclusion of the whole service is proved by the language of Amalarius Metensis, about A.D. 827:—"It appears to us that the office is called the *mass* from the place at which the priest begins to offer the sacrifice to God to the *last* benediction; *i.e.* from the offertory (of bread and wine for the communion) down to *Ite; Missa est.*" De Eccl. Off. l. iii. c. 36. Hittorp. p. 207. He accordingly says of the piece of consecrated bread left on the altar *after* communion:—"This piece remains on the altar to *the end of the mass.*" Ibid. c. 35; p. 206. Similarly Rabanus Maurus, A.D. 847:—"After the communion, and after the canticle *Agnus Dei*, when the priest has given the blessing to the people, the deacon announces that *the office of the mass* is over, *(missæ officium esse peractum,)* giving leave to go." De Instit. Cleri, l. i. c. 33. Hittorp. p. 329.

CHAP. II. SECT. III.

III. Concurrent with these changes, there was, as might be expected, a gradual but rapid decline in frequency of reception among the laity. This was certain to follow, when men were taught that a special benefit attended the *hearing* of mass by those who did not communicate, and that a less careful preparation (if any) was needed for that than for the actual reception of the Sacrament. Such a result must have been very observable by the beginning of the sixth century; for we find the Council of Agde attempting by one decree to check the mischief, which it helped to foster by another. In its eighteenth canon, it determined that "laymen who did not communicate on the Lord's Nativity, at Easter, and Pentecost, should not be believed to be Catholics, nor reckoned among them."[1] Towards the close of this century an attempt seems to have been made in Spain to restore the earlier rule; for in 572 the Council of Lugo adopted a number of canons, collected by Martin, Bishop of Braga, chiefly from the decrees of the Greek Church, among which appears, with some difference of wording, the first part of the second canon of Antioch,[2] already quoted:—"If any one enter the Church of God, and hear the sacred Scriptures, and out of caprice[3]

[1] Labb. tom. iv. col. 1386. [2] See p. 47.

[3] *Pro luxuria sua.* This clause (in the original of Antioch, *κατά τινα ἀταξίαν*) gave the authorities great scope for leniency, and must have gone far to make the canon useless. However, at this time a more stringent rule would not have been endured.

turn away from the communion of the Sacrament, and break the rule of discipline appointed in the observance of the mysteries, we determine that such an one be cast out of the Catholic Church."[1] There is no reason to think that the Fathers at Lugo had in view the peculiar practice of any sect, as has been pleaded with regard to those of Antioch. Another effort in the same direction meets us in France, a few years later. The Council of Mâcon, in Burgundy, held in 585, ordered that "on every Lord's day the oblation of the altar should be offered by all men and women, both of bread and wine."[2] This of course implies communion, as offerings for the use of the altar were received from communicants only.[3] In the latter part of the next century, the canon of Agde, which ordered the laity to communicate at least three times a year, was revived by a synod of Bishops assembled at Autun.[4] About the same time, Theodore of Tarsus, Archbishop of Canterbury (A.D. 668), states that, while in the Greek Church the ancient rule was still observed, by which both clergy and laity who neglected communion for three successive Sundays[5] were excommunicated, the Romans communicated those who desired it, but inflicted no penalty for the omission of the duty.[6]

[1] Capitula Martini Bracar. c. lxxxiii. Labb. tom. v. col. 914.

[2] Conc. Matisc. II. can. iv. Labb. tom. v. col. 981.

[3] See p. 37.

[4] Conc. Augustod. A.D. 670, can. xiv. Labb. tom. v. App. col. 1887.

[5] See p. 50, note [2]. [6] Penitentiale, tom. i. p. 46. Lut. Par. 1677.

In the eighth century, the venerable Bede, writing to Ecgbriht, Archbishop of York, says that in England even the more religious laity did not presume to communicate in the most holy mysteries except on Christmas-day, the Epiphany, and Easter. At the same time he asserted the utility of daily communion for all classes, and urged that there were numbers of all ages "innocent and of most chaste conversation," who might communicate without the least scruple every Sunday and Saint's day;—a practice which Ecgbriht himself, he adds, had seen at Rome.[1] Nevertheless, when, only a few years later, the same Ecgbriht compiled a set of canons for the use of his province, he contented himself with the rule of Agde, which obliged to communion only thrice in the year.[2] The Capitulary of Theodulf, Bishop of Orleans, assigned to the year 797, enjoins a reception every Sunday in Lent, and every day from Maundy Thursday to Saturday in Easter week inclusive.[3] About the same time,[4] Charlemagne inserted the canon of Lugo, already given, in a collection of ecclesiastical decrees, designed by him

[1] Opp. p. 311. Cantab. 1722. This was in 734. He asserts (Ibid) that daily communion was the practice in Italy, Gaul, Africa, Greece, and all the East. From other authorities, some of which are given in the text, we infer that it could only have been so with a few.

[2] Excerptions of Ecgbriht, A.D. 740, can. xxxviii. Johnson's English Canons, P. i. p. 192. Oxf, 1850.

[3] Cap. xli. Mansi, tom. xiii. col. 1005.

[4] This is shown by the mention of Erchembald the Chancellor in the Preface. He is known to have been Chancellor in 797. See the notes of Baluz. in Capit. Reg. Franc, tom. ii. col. 1247. Par. 1667.

to direct the practice of the Bishops of the empire.[1] In 813, the third Council of Tours ordained that the laity should "communicate, if not more frequently, at least thrice in the year."[2] In the later books of the Capitulary of the French kings, compiled by Benedict of Mentz, in 845, it is decreed that "all shall communicate in the sacred Eucharist on Lord's days and the great Festivals, except those who have been enjoined to abstain."[3] In the same collection is an order in accordance with the ninth Apostolical canon, that "all who enter the Church shall communicate, unless they have been excommunicated by their Bishop."[4] The tide still flowed as well as ebbed, though on the whole the cause of piety lost way. In 858, Herard, Archbishop of Tours, ordered in his province, that "the people should communicate

[1] Capit. u. s. Add. iv. c. li.; tom. i. col. 1204. The canon, as given in the Capit., differs in one word from the common reading of the excerptions of Martin. It begins thus:—"If any one enter the Church of God, and hear *not* the sacred Scriptures," &c. The negative particle is found in one ancient MS. of the original; but has evidently crept in by mistake. See Baluz. not. Capit. tom. ii. col. 1250.

[2] Labb. tom. vii. col. 1269. This canon is in the earlier part of the Capitulary of the French kings, compiled by Angesisus, A.D. 827, l. ii. c. xlv.; tom. i. col. 750. They appear to have *recommended* weekly communion, where it was possible; but to have *enforced* it only thrice a year. See the next note.

[3] Capitul. l. v. c. cccxxxiv.; tom. i. col. 896. This order is ascribed to the advice of the Bishops and others, *i.e.* of the sixth Council of Paris, under Lewis the Pious, in 829. See L. iii. c. xx. Labb. tom. vii. col. 1664. The Council, however, specified no days, but advised communion, "when it was possible." In Capitul. l. vi. c. clxx.; u. s. col. 951, it is ordered that the faithful shall "communicate, if it can be done, every Lord's day, unless criminal and open offences prevent them."

[4] L. vii. c. cccclxxii.; tom. i. col. 1130.

every third or fourth Lord's day."[1] Nicholas I., who became Pope the same year, was somewhat singular in his rule; for we find him exhorting the Bulgarians to receive the Sacrament every day in Lent.[2] An unknown homilist, probably of this age, joins a daily communion in Lent with reception every Lord's day throughout the year.[3] Nearly two centuries after the time of Theodulf, we find his Capitulary adopted by the Anglo-Saxon Elfric, who became Bishop of Wilton in 994, and Archbishop of Canterbury in the year following.[4] Not long after, while S. Alphege sat at Canterbury, a Council of the lay and clerical rulers of the nation was held at Eanham (supposed to be Ensham, in Oxfordshire), from which proceeded many useful regulations in matters ecclesiastical as well as secular. Among them was the following:—"Let every one, who will understand his own need, prepare himself to go to housel at least thrice in the year, so as it is requisite for him."[5] This canon is repeated in the Church laws of Cnute the Dane eight years later.[6]

During the eleventh and twelfth centuries the neglect of the holy communion by the laity must

[1] Cap. liii. Capit. Reg. Franc. tom. i. col. 1291.

[2] Resp. ad Bulg. ix. Labb. tom. viii. col. 520.

[3] Serm. xxv. in App. ad Opp. Ambros.; tom. viii. p. 129.

[4] Johnson's Engl. Canons, P. i. p. 477; c. 41.

[5] Ibid. p. 487; can. 20. Mr. Thorpe's Tr. in note. Alphege sat from 1006 to 1013.

[6] Ibid. p. 509; c. 19. He reigned from 1017 to 1036.

have increased continually throughout the Western Church. Had it been otherwise, men would hardly have been prepared for the next downward step which was taken, under the guidance of Innocent III., at the beginning of the thirteenth. His famous constitution, *Omnis utriusque sexus*, adopted by the fourth Lateran Council, A.D. 1215, enjoins, under a penalty, but one reception in each year, viz. at Easter.[1] The general practice in the communion of Rome has been determined from that time by this unfortunate decree; though some provincial Synods in the same or the next century endeavoured, to their honour, to establish a better rule. The Council of Toulouse, for instance, in A.D. 1229[2]; that of Albi in Languedoc, 1254[3]; and that of Lambeth,[4] 1378, republished the rule of Agde. The Council of Avignon, in 1281, exhorted, and perhaps obliged to communion at least twice in the year, viz. at Easter and Whitsuntide.[5] Others, however, and by far the greater number, contented themselves with enforcing the law of Innocent.[6] Among these was the so-called

[1] Can. xxi. Labb. tom. xi. P. i. col. 172.

[2] Can. xiii. Ibid. col. 430.

[3] Can. xxix. Ibid. col. 728.

[4] Constitutions of Sudbury, c. iv. Johnson's Engl. Cann. P. ii. p. 444.

[5] Cap. v. Labb. tom. xi. P. i. col. 1178. "Recipere . . studeant diligenter, præsertim in festis Resurrectionis Domini et Pentecostes. . . . Qui si venire recusaverint seu recipere, eorum ordinarii . . . . ipsos puniant."

[6] *E.g.* see the Counc. of Sens, A.D. 1269, can. iv., in Labb. tom. xi. P. i. col. 914; of Nismes, A.D. 1284, ibid. col. 1210; of Bourges, 1286, cap. viii.

General Council of Trent, by which the following canon was established in 1551:—"If any one shall deny that all and singular the faithful of Christ of either sex, when they have come to years of discretion, are bound to communicate every year, at least at Easter, according to the precept of holy mother Church, let him be anathema." [1]

CHAP. II. SECT. IV.

IV. When the laity had learnt to neglect the communion, and to satisfy themselves with *hearing mass*, it would of course often happen that, although many were present, the priest was the sole communicant. How early such a result became observable it is impossible to say. Some writers quote S. Chrysostom to show that instances of it occurred, occasionally, at least, in the fourth century:—"In vain is there a daily sacrifice. To no purpose do we stand at the altar. There is no one to communicate." [2] This is, however, I am persuaded, no more than an example of the hyperbolical language so common with this Father; for it is really incredible that a teacher so zealous and influential as S. Chrysostom should have failed,—and that in Antioch, the fourth great city of the

ibid. P. ii. col. 1252; Ravenna II., 1311, Rubr. xv. ibid. col. 1586; Valladolid, 1322, cap. xxvii. ibid. col. 1707; Avignon, 1337, cap. iv. col. 1853; Toledo, 1339, cap. v. col. 1871.

[1] Sess. xiii. De Euch. can. ix.

[2] Hom. lxi. ad Antioch.; cited as a testimony to private masses by Harding, Answer to Jewel, Div. 34, in Jewel's Reply, Art. i. p. 65 (Lond. 1609); by Espencæus, De Euch. Ador. l. i. c. ii. Opp. p. 1071, col. i. Comp. c. iii.; p. 1074, col. 2.

world,—to induce at least some few of the laity to receive at every celebration. His meaning must have been that only a few—or perhaps a few compared with the vast numbers who flocked to hear his preaching—were wont to partake at the daily communion. In the seventh and eighth centuries, however, it was probably a very common thing for the priest to receive alone; for in the early part of the ninth, there appear clear traces of a still further development of the corrupt practice which we have seen sanctioned by the Councils of Orleans and Agde. In 813 the Council of Mentz found it necessary to forbid priests to say mass when no one else was present.[1] The same prohibition was thought necessary in France a few years later:—"A blameworthy custom," says the Council of Paris, A.D. 829, "has in very many places crept in, partly from negligence, partly from avarice, viz. that some of the presbyters celebrate the solemn rites of masses without attendants."[2] The same prohibition occurs in the Capitulary of the French kings,[3] and in the excerptions of Herard, Archbishop of Tours, 858, made for the use of his own clergy.[4] Regino, A.D. 892, ascribes a similar but spurious decree to Anacletus[5]; and after

[1] Can. xliii. Labb. tom. vii. col. 1251.

[2] Cap. xlviii. Ibid. col. 1628.

[3] Lib. v. c. clix.; tom. i. col. 855. Sim. in Addit. see c. ix. col. 11, 37.

[4] Cap. xxviii. Capit. Reg. Franc. tom. i. col. 1289.

[5] Lib. i. c. cxxxii. In c. cxci. he ascribes a decree very similar to those of Mentz and Paris to a Council of Nantes, which is not in the collection

him the tradition was handed on by Burchard, A.D. 996[1]; by Ivo, 1092[2]; and Gratian, 1131.[3] The three last named quote from a decree falsely assigned to Soter, which orders that "no presbyter should presume to celebrate the solemn rites of masses, unless two persons were present, and answered him, so that he himself made the third."

The practice here forbidden was unquestionably one consequence of the general remissness with regard to the holy Eucharist, which had been encouraged by the almost authorized neglect of that which all men knew to be its most important part. Doctrinally, however, it might be made to stand on very different grounds from the corruption that gave it birth. It may be highly inexpedient to permit a priest to administer the Sacrament to himself, without witnesses, when none of his people are willing to partake with him; but apart from the consideration of expediency, there is, perhaps, little to object to it; and it has appeared to some a lawful subject of regret[4] that the indevotion of the many should have been allowed to intercept the blessing which the more frequent commemoration of the sacrifice of

of canons under that name in the *Concilia*. Mansi, tom. xviii. col. 165. See note [2], p. 56. These multiplied prohibitions, however, whether we know their source or not, equally illustrate the rapid progress of the evil.

[1] Decr. l. iii. c. lxxiv.; fol. 93, fa. 1.

[2] Decr. P. ii. c. 127. Opp. P. i. p. 71.

[3] P. iii. Dist. i. c. lxi. *Hoc quoque.*

[4] See a note of Bishop Cosin in Nicholls on the Book of C. P.; vol. i. Addit. Notes, p. 53. See p. 105, note [1].

the death of Christ, though by a solitary worshipper, may be expected to bring down upon the Church at large. My own opinion is, that perhaps upon the whole the general good is better consulted by the retention of our present rule, except in the communion of the sick, when from the infectious nature of the disease, or other causes, the required number cannot be obtained. In the ninth century, however, men had less experience of past evil to teach them caution, and it is probable that a practical absurdity involved in the solitary mass led to its condemnation far more than any doctrinal difficulty, or anticipation of bad consequence. The Councils above quoted, in common with many early writers, ask, "How can the priest say, *The Lord be with you*, when there is no one to answer, *And with thy spirit?* Or, for whom can he be supposed to pray when he says, *Remember, Lord, all those who stand around*, when none but himself is there?"

When the abuse had fully established itself, some writers, as Peter Damian, A.D. 1057,[1] Odo of Cambray, 1105,[2] and Stephen of Autun, 1112,[3] attempted to meet the above-mentioned difficulty by suggesting that the priest addressed himself to the absent Church

[1] He wrote a treatise on the subject, with the title, *Dominus vobiscum*. It is in the collection of Ferrarius de Divin. Offic. Rom. 1591. See especially c. 10; p. 374.

[2] Can. Miss. Expos. Dist. ii. ad id *Et omnium circumstantium;* in Biblioth. PP. tom. xii. col. 404. Colon. 1618.

[3] De Sacram. Alt. c. xiii. Opp. Honor. et Alior. col. 1289. Par. 1854.

"as present by faith, and communicating in the Sacraments by charity," and made the responses in its name, one member answering for all. This explanation is approved by Cardinal Bona.[1] Others, as Innocent III., said that the angels present at the mass were the by-standers to whom the prayer in the canon must be referred.[2]

CHAP. II. SECT. V.

V. The ingenuity of the mediæval divines and their successors in the Church of Rome was exercised on many other speculations in defence, or, as they would view it, in explanation of the novel practice. For example, since all acknowledged that the sacrifice of the mass was incomplete unless the victim was consumed,[3] it became necessary to provide a mode of reception that did not require actual communion. "The taking of this Sacrament is of three kinds," says one; "that which is sacramental only, *i.e.* when sinners take it; that which is spiritual only, in which manner the pious take it through an ardent desire, both in Church, and out of it whenever they please, when they do not actually take the Sacra-

[1] Rer. Liturg. l. ii. c. v. § i.; p. 319. Sim. Sala, note (4) to l. i. c. xiii. § vi.; tom. i. p. 275.

[2] De Myst. Miss. l. ii. c. xxv. Opp. tom. i. p. 344. Colon. 1575.

[3] Thus Bonacina argues from 1 Cor. xi.:—"Hence it may be inferred that the fruit and the effect of the sacrifice is not given *ex opere operato*, except where there is reception; forasmuch as reception belongs to the essence of the sacrifice." Disp. de Sacram. iv. Q. viii. Punct. ii. § 7. Opp. tom. i. p. 83. Par. 1632. Sim. Jodoc. Lorichius Thesaur. Theol.; De Sacram. Euch. c. xvii.; p. 1728 (Frib. Brisg. 1609): Summa Sylvestrina, P. i. p. 344; De Euch. c. iii. § 2 (Lugd. 1593), &c.

ment; and that which is both sacramental and spiritual, in which the righteous receive, when they actually take the Sacrament."[1] This doctrine held its ground in England until the abolition of the practice which it was introduced to justify. Thus Tunstal, A.D. 1538, in a reply, drawn up at the command of Henry, to the ambassadors of the Protestant Princes of Germany, employs the following argument:—"If things are closely examined, private masses will amount to a sort of private communion, where if circumstances are duly managed, if the laity there present are under dispositions for repentance, if they be heartily sorry for their sins and address to God for His pardon, if they 'present themselves a living sacrifice acceptable to God,' there is no question but that they communicate with the priest in a spiritual manner, though their number is small, and they abstain from a corporal receiving."[2]

The next step was to maintain that the priest received sacramentally for and in behalf of the people, while they communicated spiritually, by which means all were enabled to offer a perfect sacrifice. A notion somewhat resembling this seems to have occurred to thinking men, almost as soon as the difficulty was presented to their minds by the

[1] Lorich. u. s. c. xvi.; p. 1725: Aquinas, P. iii. Q. lxxx. A. i. ad 3^{m}; p. 180: &c.

[2] Collier, Eccl. Hist. P. ii. B. ii. p. 147. It is astonishing that writers who speak thus of the preparation for hearing mass do not perceive that persons so disposed are wrong in not receiving.

corrupt custom of the Church. Thus Strabo argued in the ninth century :—"That the same holy celebration of masses may be believed to benefit not a few but many, we may and ought to say that the others (*i.e.* those who do not communicate), persevering in the faith and devotion of those who offer and communicate, are said to be and are partakers of the same oblation and communion. . . . When the priests celebrate masses alone, it may be understood that they for whom those offices are celebrated, and whom the priest in certain responses represents, co-operate with him in that action."[1] In the course of time, when communion was, except at Easter, almost universally neglected, the notion in which the serious had found consolation, and the irreligious an excuse, assumed with some, as might be expected, a more precise and formal shape. Thus Hugo de S. Victore, in the early part of the twelfth century :—"The communion, which is then sung (after the Agnus Dei), intimates that all the faithful communicate in the Body of Christ, because the minister takes it sacramentally for all, that it may be received spiritually by himself and all."[2] Honorius of Autun, a cotemporary of Hugo, declares his belief that if any one in danger of death "were to refuse, in his zeal for righteousness, to receive the communion" from a wicked priest, "and did not doubt but that

[1] De Reb. Eccl. c. 22. Hittorp. p. 410.
[2] Specul. Myst. Eccl. c. 7. Ferrar. p. 727.

he communicated daily by the mouth of the priests in the unity of the Church, he would be saved, if he died, by that faith."[1] "Every Christian," says Lyranus, A.D. 1320, "is still bound to be refreshed by this Sacrament once in the year. He is also refreshed by it daily; for the priests not only take this Sacrament for themselves, but for the people too."[2] Similarly S. Vincent Ferrer:—"The mouth eats and receives food, and all the other members are refreshed. The same with the Sacrament of the altar. All Christendom is one body, united by faith and charity, having many members. The priest is the mouth of this body. When, therefore, the priest communicates all the members are refreshed."[3] And again:—"As the mouth eats for all the members, so the priest spiritually for all Christians."[4] Eggeling and Biel, about 1480:—"We have all been baptized into one body. The prelate, or priest, is the mouth of this body. . . . That bread, therefore, which is daily eaten by any priest,—by that bread the whole body, which is the Church, is daily refreshed. . . . The priest who communicates daily is a member of the Church: therefore all the members of the Church eat that bread daily."[5] This principle was employed to

[1] Elucidarium, l. i. § 30. Opp. col. 1131. Par. 1854.

[2] In Luke xv. *Et manducemus.* Bibl. P. v. fol. 165, fa. 2.

[3] Serm. in Epiph. ii.; Sermonum P. Hiemal. fol. lxiii. fa. 1. Lugd. 1513.

[4] Serm. in Oct. Corp. Christ.; Serm. P. Æstiv. fol. cviii. fa. 2.

[5] Can. Miss. Expos. Lect. lxxi.; fol. clix. fa. 1. Par. 1516.

explain those passages in the canon which implied a general communion of all present. Thus Clichtovæus, who died in 1543, commenting on the prayer, "Grant that this most holy mixture of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ may become health of mind and body *to us who receive*,"—says that it is a petition that "it may become health of mind and body both to the priest who offers, and to all who by wish and desire receive spiritually through the priest."[1] The Protestant ambassadors, in their address to Henry VIII., speak of this as the common opinion of that day, nor is the truth of their assertion questioned in the reply of Bishop Tunstal.[2]

CHAP. II. SECT. VI.

VI. For a long period before the Reformation there seems to have been as little alteration in the habits of the people as in the opinions of their teachers. The picture which Erasmus gives us of the popular religion of his day exhibits, therefore, with sufficient truth the state of things prevailing in the West for many generations. "There are some," says that writer, who is by no means always the most willing

[1] Elucidat. P. iii.; fol. 148, fa. 1.

[2] Collier. P. ii. B. ii.; p. 144. Controversial writers did not fail to take advantage of this notion, when obliged to defend the denial of the cup to the laity. Thus Eckius, the opponent of Luther:—"The priest in the person of the whole people offers and receives under each kind; in whose person the whole people ought joyfully to believe that it drinks the blood of Christ by a kind of spiritual reception." Enchiridion adv. Luther, c. x. in fine; fol. 76, fa. 2. Ingolst. 1541.

witness against corruptions which the Church had fostered,—"there are some who ask for a communion in the mass. So (I confess) was it ordained by Christ, and so was it wont of old to be observed. But it is not the priests who stand in the way of a return to this practice, but the laity, in whom charity, alas! hath grown too cold. That heavenly food must not be thrust on the unwilling, or those who nauseate it. It will not be denied to those who earnestly seek it. Now what communion can there be, when in some places the Churches are well-nigh empty at the time of communion? Some go home as soon as they are aspersed, and make their exit before the introit. Others after they have heard (but not understood) the Gospel. Yet, after the priest has said, *Lift up your hearts*, and *Let us give thanks*, then were the people's chief part;—when, the priest keeping silence, each one is speaking with God. And *they* meanwhile are gossiping in the market-place, or drinking in the tavern;—though even these act with more reverence than those who are trifling through the whole sacred rite in the Churches."[1] In throwing the whole blame upon the laity, Erasmus implies that as a body the clergy desired the communion of all present. It is quite clear, however, that no such desire could have been generally entertained, or some attempt would have been made to re-establish the ancient practice. At the same time,

[1] De Amab. Eccl. Concord. Opp. tom. v. col. 503. Lugd. Bat. 1704.

it is probable that Bucer, to whom we owe a very different representation, has exaggerated as greatly on the other side. *He* tells us that it was a most rare thing to find a priest who "thought that the Sacrament ought to be distributed in masses—and that, not only in those private masses, as they were called, with which they filled every corner of the Churches, nay, even of private houses, but even in those which they called public and great, as being celebrated on the high altar, and with greater solemnity." He adds that, "in France matters had in consequence arrived at such a pass, that persons intending to communicate in the Eucharist, thought that they ought to hear mass first, and afterwards receive communion of the Eucharist in another place."[1]

The Council of Trent had it in its power to provide an effectual remedy for these evils by a resolute condemnation of private masses, and a strict return to the early rule. Nevertheless, it contented itself with a very faint expression of disapproval, and deliberately perpetuated the practice to which so many abuses, and so much error in doctrine, could trace their rise. "The most holy Synod could wish," it said, "that in every mass the faithful assisting would communicate, not only in spiritual affection, but also by the sacramental reception of the

[1] De. Cœn. Dom. Admin. l. ii. c. xxix.; pp. 271, 272. Neubr. Danub. 1546.

Eucharist, that more abundant fruit of this most holy sacrifice might accrue to them; and yet, if that may not always be, it condemns not for that reason, as private and unlawful, those masses in which the priest alone communicates sacramentally, but approves, and so recommends them; forasmuch as those masses also ought to be esteemed in reality common, partly because in them the people communicate spiritually, but partly because they are celebrated by the public minister of the Church, not for himself only, but for all the faithful who belong to the body of Christ."[1]

We see that the Council has here adopted fully the scholastic distinction between sacramental and spiritual communion, and teaches that the people may truly communicate, though they purposely neglect the only mode of doing so ordained by Jesus Christ. By this means it has not only perpetuated the custom which it affected to regret, but has provided a ready answer to every future demand for a return to the Apostolic practice.

[1] Sess. xxii. cap. vi. *De sacrif. Missæ.*

CHAPTER III.

NON-COMMUNICANTS ORDERED TO LEAVE THE QUIRE IN THE FIRST, AND THE CHURCH IN THE SECOND REFORMED OFFICE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. OPINIONS OF OUR BEST DIVINES BEFORE AND SINCE THE LAST REVISION. THE CONDEMNATION OF GAZING AND ADORING IN OUR FORMULARIES AGREEABLE TO THE TEACHING OF THE FATHERS.

CHAP. III.

We turn now to that part of the question which immediately concerns ourselves, viz. the rule of the reformed Church of England, with respect to the presence of persons who do not communicate.

CHAP. III. SECT. I.

I. In the first reformed Office, published in 1549, the sentences of the offertory were followed by this rubric :—"Then so many as shall be partakers of the holy communion, shall tarry still in the quire, or in some convenient place nigh the quire, the men on the one side, and the women on the other side. All other (that mind not to receive the said holy communion) shall depart out of the quire, except the ministers and clerks."[1] There is evidently some error in this rubric as it stands, for it implies that "the ministers and clerks" may be non-communicants. The last clause, which

[1] In Records appended to Collier's Eccl. Hist. n. lix.

excepts them, should probably be omitted. Even thus there is great awkwardness of expression, which can only be remedied, so far as I see, by supposing that the second sentence was intended to run thus :— "All other (that mind not to receive the said holy communion) shall depart out of the *Church*." A hasty correction from change of opinion, or by a second hand, may perhaps explain the peculiarity. However, as the rubric was published, and as we must take it, it certainly does not forbid the presence in *Church* of those who do not receive, but only expels them from the quire. Cranmer, who was at the head of the commission for the construction of this liturgy, was certainly willing at that time to permit the presence of non-communicants. In fact, in his reply to the Devonshire rebels in the same year, while arguing against forced communion, he speaks in a manner which, unless he purposely so expressed himself as to avoid raising the question, seems to imply that the alternative of sending them out of Church had not yet presented itself to his mind :— "Although I would exhort every good Christian man often to receive the holy communion, yet I do not recite all these things to the intent that I would, in this corrupt world, where men live so ungodly as they do, that the old canons should be restored again, which command every man present to receive the communion with the priest ; which canons, if they were now used, I fear that many would now receive

it unworthily."[1] It is clear, too, from the language of Bucer, in his Animadversions on the Book of Common Prayer, written at the end of 1550, that little or no progress had as yet been made towards a return to the old custom:—"All means should be employed to bring about that those who are present at the communion be partakers of the Sacrament."[2] However, in the revision of 1552, though the primitive rule, which obliged all who came to prayers to stay and receive, was not restored, the reformers made as near an approach to it as was then practicable, by ordering all to leave the church who did not intend to communicate. An exhortation appointed to be read immediately after the prayer for the Church Militant contained the following passage:—"Whereas ye offend God so sore in refusing this holy banquet, I admonish, exhort, and beseech you, that unto this unkindness ye will not add any more: which thing ye shall do, if ye stand by as gazers and lookers on them that do communicate, and be no partakers of the same yourselves. . . . Wherefore, rather than you should do so, depart you hence, and give place to them that be godly disposed."[3]

At the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, in 1559, several changes in the Liturgy were proposed, though but a few were carried into effect. The exhortation

[1] Answer to Rebels, art. iii. Works, p. 172. Camb. 1846.

[2] Censur. in Ord. Eccl. c. xxvii. Script. Anglic. p. 495. Basil. 1577.

[3] Cardwell's Liturgies Compared, p. 285.

above quoted was left untouched; but among the alterations agitated was one which would have brought the practice of the Church of England still nearer to its professed model of antiquity. It appears, from a letter of Guest, one of the commissioners of revision, and afterwards Bishop of Rochester, addressed to Sir William Cecil, that there was a desire on the part of some to send away the non-communicants before the recital of the Nicene Creed:—"The Creed is ordained to be said only of the communicants, because Dionysius, and Chrysostom, and Basil, in their Liturgies, say that the learners were shut out, or the creed was said; because it is the prayer of the faithful only, which were but the communicants. *For that they which did not receive were taken for that time as not faithful.* Therefore Chrysostom saith, That they which do not receive, be as men doing penance for their sin."[1] This further change, as I have said, was not effected; but from the language of Guest we may infer that the principle on which the Elizabethan divines continued to exclude the non-communicants was the same on which the question had been decided by S. Chrysostom more than a thousand years before. And here let me ask whether, with this fact before us, it would be too much to assume that their martyred predecessors had introduced the custom because they knew that it was in conformity with

[1] Cardwell's Conferences, ch. ii.; p. 51.

the ancient principle and rule. Mr. Wilberforce, without a shadow of proof, asserts that their "sentence of exclusion" was introduced by "the *Puritan* party."[1] Another writer on the same side has ventured to speak of it as "that spawn of Calvinistic theology."[2] Are these assertions true? There can be no doubt that they were acquainted with the ancient canons. We have heard Cranmer quote them, though in 1549 he did not yet see how to adapt them to the times. Other evidence from the writings of those who framed and sanctioned the exhortation to depart I have been unable to find; but Jewel, who may be said to have been almost one of them, asserts that in this, as in every thing else, they claimed to be, and believed themselves to be, followers of the early undivided Church. "Good brethren," he says, in his well-known sermon at Paul's Cross, in the spring of the year 1560, "I will make it plain unto you through God's grace, by the most ancient writers that were in and after the Apostles' time, and by the order of the first primitive Church, that then there could be no private mass, and that whoso would not communicate with the priest was then commanded out

[1] Eucharist, p. 380. In p. 379 he speaks of it as "this order to *send the multitude away.*" The allusion to Matt. xiv. 15 is infelicitous, if not profane. *That* multitude was fainting for lack of food, and to send them away to seek it when Christ was at hand showed some forgetfulness of His power, or of His willingness to relieve every distress; but in the case before us, the multitudes, though affectionately pressed to eat, refuse to do so. Can it be wrong to send such away?

[2] Right of all the Baptized, p. 21.

of the congregation." He accordingly quotes the Apostolical canon and other authorities, and then apostrophizing those to whom he appeals, proceeds:—"If we be deceived therein, ye are they that have deceived us. . . . . Thus ye ordered the holy communion in your time: *the same we received at your hands, and have faithfully delivered it unto the people.*"[1]

It is probable that some time elapsed before the order under consideration met with universal compliance. In the Second Book of Homilies, published in 1562, an allusion to the condemned practice was still deemed necessary;—"Every one of us must be guests and not gazers, eaters and not lookers. . . . . Of necessity we must be ourselves partakers of this table, and not beholders of others."[2] Nay, it is not unlikely that it subsisted here and there several years later; for we find Cartwright affirming, in 1573, that "in divers places the ignorant people that have been misled in Popery have knocked and kneeled unto the consecrated bread, and held up their hands whilst the minister hath given it,—not those only which have received it, but those which have been in the Church and looked on."[3] He adds that he "spoke of that which he knew and had seen with his eyes";

[1] Serm. at Paul's Cross, pp. 56, 57. Lond. 1609. Sim. in Apol. in Enchir. Theol. vol. i. p. 217.

[2] Homily of the Worthy Receiving, &c. part i.

[3] Reply to Ans. to Admon. p. 130. Sect. ult. in Whitgift's Def. of Ans. Tr. xv. ch. i. div. vi. Works, vol. iii. p. 85. Camb. 1853.

but he does not say *when* he saw it. It may have been some years before he wrote.

If it should be asked why the notice to withdraw was not at once observed in every Church in England, the answer is very obvious. It was not enforced by any penalty. Non-communicants were exhorted to depart, but were not driven out if they insisted upon staying. This is clear enough from the manner in which the new rule was put forth; namely, as a solemn warning to those who neglected communion, and not in a rubric or canon; but we are also told it, in so many words, by Bishop Jewel. His opponent, Harding, had said that it "appeared by his sermon (at Paul's Cross) that all the people ought to receive or to be driven out of the Church."[1] To this Jewel replies (A.D. 1565):—"You know this is neither the doctrine nor the practice of our Church. Howbeit the ancient doctors have both taught so, and also practised the same. Anacletus saith, After the consecration is ended, let all receive, unless they will be thrust from the Church."[2]

CHAP. III. SECT. II.

II. It is desirable that we should ascertain next, what were the sentiments with regard to the chief point in question that prevailed among our best divines between the Reformation and the last revision of the Liturgy.

[1] Harding's Answer, div. 32, in Jewel's Reply to Ans. art. i.; p. 57. Lond. 1609.

[2] Reply, u. s.; p. 59. See p. 60, note [1].

The Communion of the Laity.

One ground of complaint perversely urged by the early Puritans against the Church was that it permitted a few to receive by themselves, while the majority of the congregation went away.[1] "This Sacrament," they said, "is a token of conjunction with our brethren, and therefore by communicating apart from them we make an apparent show of distraction."[2] To this Whitgift replied that "the Book of Common Prayer doth greatly commend and like the receiving of the whole Church together, but if that cannot be obtained (and it cannot, and they will not have men compelled unto it), it secludeth not those that be well disposed, so they be a competent number. And the Book doth exhort those to depart which do not communicate, with a warning from whence they depart, so that you may well understand that the meaning of the Book is that all that be present should communicate."[3]

[1] Cartwright suggested as a remedy, that "those which would withdraw themselves, should be, by ecclesiastical discipline at all times, and now also, under a godly prince, by civil punishment, brought to communicate with their brethren," p. 117, sect. 3; in Whitgift, u. s. c. v. div. xi. p. 552. On the other hand, in the Admonition, in defence of which Cartwright came forward in his Reply, the Church was vilified for too great strictness in this respect, and accused of "thrusting men in their sin to the Lord's Table." Whitg. u. s. p. 553. The latter became the general view of the Puritans, and at the Restoration their wish was, to have no rule whatever for the communion of the laity. See Cardwell's Conferences, ch. vii.; p. 321. The Bishops, in their reply to this demand, remarked:—"Formerly our Church was quarrelled at for not compelling men to the communion; now, for urging men. How should she please?" Ibid. p. 354.

[2] See Hooker, Eccl. Pol. b. v. ch. lxviii. § 10; vol. ii. p. 376. Oxf. 1841.

[3] Defence of Answer, Tr. ix. c. vi. div. viii.; vol. ii. p. 549.

Hooker's reply to the same cavil shows that at the time when he wrote it had become the general custom for those who did not receive to leave the Church, and that he approved thoroughly of their so doing :— "I ask them on which side unity is broken, whether on theirs that depart, or on theirs that being left behind do communicate. First, in the one, it is not denied that they may have reasonable cause of departure, and that then even they are delivered from just blame. Of such kind of causes two are allowed, namely, danger of impairing health, and necessary business requiring our presence otherwhere. And may not a third cause, which is unfitness at the present time, detain us as lawfully back as either of these two? True it is that we cannot hereby altogether excuse ourselves, for that we ought to prevent this and do not. But if we have committed a fault in not preparing our minds before, shall we therefore aggravate the same with a worse, the crime of unworthy participation? . . . There is in all the Scripture of God no one syllable which doth condemn communicating among a few when the rest are departed from them."[1]

In one of the controversial works of Whitaker, who died in 1595, it is affirmed that "anciently the *whole* Church used to assemble to partake of the Lord's Supper, and that, in some places, daily."[2]

[1] Eccl. Pol, u. s.

[2] Prælect. Controv. Sec. Q. vi. c. iii.; p. 474. Cantab. 1599.

From Field's Book of the Church I borrow the following testimony:—"It is known that the celebration of the holy mystery and Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood had the name of *mass* from the dismissing of all non-communicants before the consecration began, so that none stayed but such as were to communicate."[1] Our next witness is Bishop Overal, who has left this approving comment on the exhortation to depart then in the Liturgy:—"A religious invective added here against the lewd and irreligious custom of the people then nursed up in popery, to be present at the communion and to let the priest communicate for them all, from whence arose that abuse of private masses; a practice so repugnant to the Scripture and to the use of the ancient Church, that at this day not any but the Romish Church through all the Christian world are known to use it, as the Greek, Syrian, Armenian, and Ethiopian Liturgies do testify: nay the Roman Liturgy itself is full against the Roman practice." He then quotes the Apostolical canon and S. Chrysostom's Third Homily on the Epistle to the Ephesians, before cited,[2] and concludes with a conjecture which has probably occurred already to the reader:—"So that this Preface and Exhortation seem to be taken out of S. Chrysostom's words:

[1] App. to b. iii.; p. 187. Oxf. 1635.

[2] See p. 45.

they are in all points so like one to the other."[1]

In the year 1620, Bishop Andrewes had occasion to consecrate a chapel near Southampton. This led him to prepare the form known by his name, which has since been much used in the consecration of Churches. He made provision in it for the administration of the holy communion, and in the first rubric that relates to it gave the following direction :—"All the people not intending to communicate are dismissed, and the doors shut."[2] A letter of Bishop Bedel to Archbishop Usher, written in 1630, shows incidentally what was the practice of the Church in Ireland at the same period. He is speaking of one who desired to be reconciled to him before receiving the holy communion :—"As I was at the Lord's Table, beginning the service of the communion

[1] Nichols on the Common Prayer, vol. i. Addit. Notes, p. 43. Lond. 1710. Yet Mr. Wilberforce claims Overal and his disciple Cosin as witnesses on his side. In the Table of Contents to his work on the Eucharist, it is said (p. xx.) that the Second Book of Edward VI. "for the first time excluded communicants from the *sacrifice*, when unprepared to partake of the *Sacrament*," and that the "mischievous effect" of this order was "regretted by Overal and Cosin." Referring to the book itself, we find a similar statement in p. 381 :—"The sentence of exclusion . . . was withdrawn, A.D. 1662 ; . . . . but the habit of attending once lost was not easily recovered. . . . . Not that there were wanting those who saw and regretted the abandonment of the ancient usage. Such was Bishop Overal," &c. Happily Mr. Wilberforce has given his authority, which proves to be a note of Cosin on the consequences of the law which forbids a priest to receive the communion by himself. See p. 85. This is a very different matter, and regret at the operation of the one rule is quite compatible with approbation of the other. That Cosin, as well as Overal, did cordially approve of the notice to depart, is shown by another of his notes that will be given in the text.

[2] Works, vol. v. p. 326. Oxf. 1846.

before the sermon, he came in, and after the sermon was done, those that communicated not being departed, he stood forth and spake to this purpose."[1] The Scottish Liturgy of 1637 retained the warning to depart, although the part of the exhortation in which it occurred was in some other respects altered.[2] The Office was drawn up in Scotland, but as it was overlooked and approved by Laud, Juxon, and Wren,[3] it furnishes a clear proof that the opinion of those divines was in favour of the established English rule. In 1639, Bishop Montague, in a synod held at Ipswich on the 8th of October, is said to have given the following directions to his clergy for the orderly administration of the Sacrament :—" After the words, or exhortation, pronounced aloud by the minister standing at the communion table to the parishioners, as yet in the Church, *Draw near*, &c., all intending to communicate are to come out of the Church into the chancel. . . . . All being come in, the chancel door is to be shut, and not to be opened till the communion is done, that no communicant depart till the dismission, no *non*-communicant come in among them, no boys, girls, or gazers be suffered to look in as at a play."[4] These instructions, though they excited the indignation of the Puritans, appear

[1] Life by Burnet, p. 54. Lond. 1685.

[2] Bulley's Variations of the Communion and Baptismal Offices. p. 29.

[3] Ibid. Pref. p. xviii.

[4] Prynne's History of Laud's Trial, p. 100. Lond. 1645.

nevertheless to make one serious concession to the unruly temper of the age. They suppose that some persons would remain in the Church without communicating;—it is probable that all would not allow themselves to be excluded;—but they cut them off from the communicants by the chancel-screen and its closed door, and they forbid them to look in. It is quite clear that Montague was not providing for the convenience of any who might desire, in the language of Mr. Wilberforce, "to join in the sacrifice without going on to the Sacrament." The prohibition to look in and gaze was practically universal; for it would be impossible for those who had to enforce it to know whether a gazer was influenced by devotion or curiosity. About six years later appeared the *Instructio Historico-Theologica* of John Forbes, a Professor at Aberdeen, and son of the good Bishop of that city, in which he argues at some length against the practice of remaining without communicating.[1] The first edition of L'Estrange's Alliance of Divine Offices was published only three years before the last revision of the Liturgy, at which the warning to non-communicants was at length left out; but we find him as clear and positive as any of our earlier authorities as to the usage of the first Christians:—"True it is that, according to the primitive rules, no man of the faithful might stay behind and not communicate, upon pain of excom-

[1] L. xi. c. vii. § 13; p. 550. Amst. 1645.

munication."[1] We remark the same thing in Cosin, who was himself employed in the revision :—"The true etymology of this word *missa* or *mass*, we do yet retain in our Churches in the *dismission* of the people ; namely, of the *ancient and genuine* mass, in which not only hymns may be sung, prayers made, Scriptures read and expounded, bread and wine blessed and consecrated, but even distributed to eat and to drink to *all that are present ;* for such a mass, or celebration of the Sacrament, our Lord appointed, and commanded to be frequently used to His coming again."[2]

It may be observed that Jewel, Overal, Forbes, and L'Estrange refer to the Apostolic canon as one authority for their assertion, and all agree in understanding it according to the version of Dionysius.

CHAP. III. SECT. III.

III. Such being the practice and opinions of our divines between the first compilation and the final revision of the Liturgy, it will be asked why the warning to non-communicants was not retained ? The answer is very simple. It was no longer necessary. The custom of staying without receiving had died out, and to all appearance, as we have seen, before the close of the sixteenth century. There was no exception even in the case of the cathedral choristers. In a calumnious attack on the clergy of Durham, published in 1642, one charge

[1] Ch. vi. Annot. M ; p. 269. Oxf. 1846.

[2] Additional Notes to Nicholls on the C. P., in vol. i. ; p. 52.

preferred against them is that they "took for their assistants at the communion the whole quire-men and children which communicated not, *contrary to the custom and practice of all Cathedral Churches.*"[1] Under these circumstances, that part of the exhortation in which the non-communicants were warned to withdraw was not needed, and as its retention prevented the use of the remainder, it became expedient to remove it. This part was accordingly omitted, and the exhortation, only slightly altered in other respects, was appointed to be read as a notice of communion, "in case the minister shall see the people negligent to come."

As it is undeniable that the altered habits of the people had rendered the change necessary, we cannot doubt that they were the cause of its being made. There is a direct proof, however, that the divines of 1662 were actually influenced by this fact, when they withdrew the warning to depart. Bishop Cosin, it is well known, was "one of the principal commissioners" for the revision, and it so happens that there have come down to us some memoranda which he made of "Particulars to be Considered, Explained, and Corrected in the Book of Common Prayer," to which it appears that "the Reviewers had very great regard, they having altered most things accordingly as was therein desired." Now among these notes

[1] A Catalogue of Superstitious Innovations, &c. p. 28; in Hierurgia Anglicana, p. 363.

is one which points out that the first and second exhortations (as they then stood) were "more fit to be read some days *before* the communion than at the very same time when the people are come to receive it;" and one of the reasons assigned is, that "they that tarry are not negligent, and *they that are negligent be gone*, and hear it not."[1]

That this was the true reason for the change is proved further by the fact that no advantage was taken by any party of the repeal of the prohibition. At least, I do not remember to have read of any attempt, either by the divines of the Restoration or their successors, to revive the practice which it had suppressed, nor am I aware that a single instance has been cited by Mr. Wilberforce or his disciples. On the contrary, our later writers agree entirely with their predecessors, both as to the nature and the propriety of the primitive usage. Thus Payne, one of the ablest opponents of the Church of Rome in the time of James II., after quoting the Apostolical canon and that of Antioch, says:—"So great a crime was it for any not to keep to constant communion, which was to be done as much by all the faithful as by the priest himself; every Christian in those devout ages who was baptized, and had not notoriously violated his baptismal covenant, so as to be put into the state and number of the public penitents, did always communicate, as often as there was any

[1] App. to Nicholls, vol. i.; No. lii.; p. 69.

Sacrament, which was, I believe, as often as they assembled for public worship; and he that had not done that in those first and purest times would have been thought almost to have been a deserter, and to have renounced his Christianity. . . . Only the πιστοὶ, *faithful*, who received the communion were allowed to be present at the celebration of it; which is a very good argument against our adversaries' opinion of the sacrifice of the mass; for, had they believed the Eucharist, though received only by the priest, had done good as a sacrifice to those who were present, although they did not partake of it, as they now do in the Church of Rome, what need they have put out and excluded all those who were non-communicants?"[1] Similarly Beveridge, commenting on Justin Martyr's description of the holy Communion:—"From these words of this Apostolic man it is clear that on every Sunday or Lord's day all the Christians, whether living in towns or in the country, were wont to meet together. When assembled, they heard the writings of the Apostles or other Scriptures, and offered their common prayers and thanksgivings to Almighty God; after which they celebrated the Eucharistic prayers and thanksgivings, that is to say, those by which the elements are consecrated to be the mystic Body and Blood of Christ;—which, being consecrated, were distributed to all present, to

[1] Sacrifice of the Mass, in Gibson's Preservative, tit. vi. ch. ii.; vol. ii. p. 74. Lond. 1738.

all who had been at the prayers and heard the holy Scriptures, and were partaken of by them. No one, therefore, went out before he had been fed with this spiritual food. So that these two Apostolical canons (viii. ix.) prescribe nothing else, but that the Apostolic discipline of the first Christians, described by S. Justin the Martyr, should be strictly observed by all who desire to remain in the communion of the Church." [1]

The later practice might have been expected to find patrons, if any where, among such of our divines as adopted that view of the holy Eucharist which is maintained in Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice; yet we do not find that they either endeavoured or desired to effect its restoration. Johnson himself says:— "I only speak of the efficacy of the oblation in behalf of such as were detained from the Communion by some involuntary and invincible obstacle; and am so far from having any good opinion of the solitary masses among the Papists, that I am fully satisfied that in the primitive Church *the oblation and communion were inseparable;* and that they had but one altar in every Church, where all, both clergy and people, both attended and received." [2]

Bingham, who has treated the subject at some length, affirms that "the most ancient and primitive custom was for all that were allowed to stay and communicate in prayers, to communicate in the

[1] Codex Prim. Vind. l. ii. c. iii. § x. Works, vol. xii. p. 22. Oxf. 1848.
[2] Unbloody Sacrifice, ch. ii. sect. ii.; vol. i. p. 401. Oxf. 1847.

participation of the Eucharist also, except only the last class of penitents. . . . These only excepted, all other baptized persons were not only admitted, but by the rule of the Church obliged to communicate in the Eucharist, under pain of ecclesiastical censure."[1] Waterland, speaking of the decree of Agde, which ordered all to wait for the Bishop's blessing, says :— "Though the dismission of the non-communicants might perhaps be deferred somewhat later now than in Chrysostom's time, yet dismissed they were before the communion properly came on, and the absurdity which Chrysostom complained of, that of staying out the whole solemnity without communicating, never was admitted in those days."[2]

CHAP. III. SECT. IV.

IV. Enough, perhaps, has now been said to show both the intention of the Church herself and the conviction of her most eminent divines. There is, however, one more than probable result of the practice now struggling to regain a footing in our country, to which it is desirable that we should advert briefly before we conclude.

[1] Antiquities, b. xv. ch. iv. sect. i. ; vol. i. p. 769.

[2] Review, ch. xiv. ; vol. iv. p. 793. Waterland thought, with Schelstrate, that both the Apostolical and the Antiochene canon ought to be received "with a softening explication" ; because, says he, "it is not reasonable to think that a modest and sober departure before communion began . . . . would be looked upon as a disturbance ; but if it were done out of dislike, or contempt, and upon factious principles, then indeed it would be apt to make great disturbance." These writers do not seem to have paid sufficient attention to the fact that the alternative of staying away altogether was always, within reasonable limits, permitted to the laity. See p. 48.

The Communion of the Laity.

In the Church of Rome, where attendance at mass without communicating has been for centuries regarded as the chief ordinary duty of religion, a habit necessarily grew up of viewing the host, as exhibited in the hands of the priest and on the altar, with feelings of intense reverence, which led at length to its becoming the avowed object of a direct adoration. That Church, with her usual policy, instead of labouring to recal her children to the more healthy simplicity of the first ages, cherished the mistaken devotion by every means at her command, and in the end, at the Thirteenth Session of Trent, declared the worship of *latria*, that is, the same worship that is paid to God Himself, to be due to the Sacrament.[1] This result was of course facilitated by that unprimitive view of the Real Presence, which she has so long adopted; but it is evident that there is danger of a tendency to the same practice from every extravagance of language upon this sacred subject. And the danger is especially great when the people are taught that by "assisting" merely, without communicating, at the "action wherein Christ's very Presence is exhibited on earth," they may receive an earnest of "that privilege which is perpetually afforded to the saints in bliss, a foretaste of the beatific vision."[2]

This superstitious tendency has betrayed itself

[1] Sess. xiii. De Euch. c. v. and can. vi.

[2] Wilberforce, pp. 413, 414.

already among the English advocates of attendance without participation. Thus one of them (whose taste for opprobrious epithets is not to be commended), argues in its behalf, that "Anglo-Zuinglians, or Anglo-Calvinists, at any rate, who regard 'the sacred elements as bare signs of a thing absent' may not on their own principles refuse permission to the devout soul to *gaze* thereby at Christ, whom the sacred elements represent." [1] Mr. Wilberforce seems to have been somewhat in advance of this a considerable time before he joined the Church of Rome. In an anonymous tract on Spiritual Communion, of which he is stated to be the author, he supposes the objection:—"Is there no danger of unduly paying worship to the creatures of bread and wine?" To this he replies:—"No more than there was danger of Moses unduly worshipping the Burning Bush, when he worshipped our Blessed Lord Really Present in it;—or rather, since the Bread and Wine become in Reality His own Body and Blood, no more than when those who worshipped Him, as did the Wise Men, in His Visible Body on earth, were in danger of worshipping His natural creatures of human flesh and blood which composed It." [2]

The former of these writers suggests, "that to bring about 'the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ,' even a rubric, if

[1] The Right of all the Baptized, &c. Pref. p. 3.
[2] Tracts on Catholic Unity, No. 8; p. 7.

needful, might be immolated."[1] I shall not be thought to speak lightly of the immolation of a rubric, if I observe that this person has proved himself equal to a far greater sacrifice. In the Twenty-fifth Article of Religion, to which, if a clergyman, he has subscribed a solemn assent, it is declared that "the Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be *gazed upon*, ... but that we should duly use them." To the same purpose are we taught in the Second Book of Homilies that at Christ's "heavenly Supper every one of us must be guests and not gazers, eaters and not lookers."[2] In equal contrast with Mr. Wilberforce's defence of *adoration* is the decisive language of the Twenty-eighth Article:—"The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not, by Christ's ordinance, reserved, carried about, lifted up, or *worshipped*"; and of the declaration appended to the Communion Office:—"No adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine, then bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored (for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians). And the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it

[1] The Right, &c. p. 26.

[2] Serm. on the Sacrament, part ii.

being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one."

The teaching of the Church of England upon this point is too clear to be questioned, and her authority will determine the conduct of all her dutiful children. It is a satisfaction, however, to know that her decision is in accordance with the religious wisdom of the first ages, her avowed model in doctrine, and, where it has been possible, in discipline likewise.

By excluding those who did not receive, the primitive Church saved *them* at least from the temptation to gaze and adore. One reason of that exclusion was, as we have seen it stated by S. Chrysostom, that those who are not in a meet state to communicate must be equally unmeet to join in the Eucharistic Office; but occasionally this objection is expressed in a manner yet more to the point of our inquiry;—as when the same Father says:—"Many laden with numberless sins, when they see the festival come, as if they were driven to it by the day itself, touch the sacred mysteries, which it is not lawful for them, while so disposed, even to *see*."[1] The author of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, describing the celebration of the Sacrament, says:—"*They* remain, who are worthy of the *sight* and communion of the Divine things."[2]

But how was it with those who did receive? It

[1] Hom. de Bapt. Christi. Opp. tom. ii. p. 441.
[2] C. ii. § 2. Opp. tom. i. p. 315.

must be confessed that after the second century there was much in the language used by divines with respect to Christ's presence in the Sacrament which, unless explained and corrected by their other teaching, would naturally lead in time to an undue reverence for the material symbols of His death. They never thought of worshipping them, and seldom directed the eyes of the people towards them[1]; but when they spoke (for example) of "seeing the Lord crucified and lying"[2] on the altar, or told their hearers that "He had passed into the earthly element and made it heavenly,"[3] or warned them not to judge of it by taste or sight,[4] they were certainly, when understood to the letter, laying a foundation on which a less instructed age might build a formal practice of creature-worship. We may well doubt whether they

[1] The strongest instance that occurs to me is in S. Chrysostom, in Ep. i. ad Cor. Hom. xxiv. sub fin. (Opp. tom. x. p. 256):—"This (τουτὶ) mystery makes earth heaven. Only throw open then the gates of heaven and look through; or rather, not of heaven, but of the heaven of heavens, and then thou wilt see that which has been said. For the most precious of all things there will I show thee lying upon the earth. For as in king's houses, the most honourable thing of all is not walls, or golden roof, but the person of the king seated on the throne; so also in heaven is the Body of the King. But this it is now permitted thee to see upon the earth." Yet this passage and its context are so worded that they are quoted by Jewel as an instance in which S. Chrysostom "withdraweth the minds of the people from the sensible elements of the bread and the wine, and lifteth them up by spiritual cogitations into heaven." Reply to Harding, art. viii. div. 21; p. 298.

[2] Chrysost. de Sacerd. Serm. iii. c. iv.; p. 42. Oxon. 1844.

[3] Gaudentius, Tr. ii. de Pasch. Biblioth. PP. tom. v. p. 946. Lugd. 1677.

[4] Cyrill. Hier. Catech. Myst. iv. § iii. Opp. p. 294. Oxon. 1703.

were alive to the danger which might result from such expressions. Their own disciples understood them, and we have no right to blame them because they did not foresee the clouds of ignorance and barbarism which were destined, before the lapse of many centuries, to overspread the Church. It has, moreover, been so ordered, that in their writings are found many passages in which they labour to raise men's thoughts above the outward sign, and fix them in faith on the unseen reality which it denotes. We are thus furnished with an incidental protest on their part against the very evil to which the extreme language that they at times employed was calculated to conduce, and with a proof that such language was not prompted by the habit of "gazing" or "adoring," or by any sentiment which would have led them to approve of it. Thus Origen:—"Not that visible bread which He held in His hands did God the Word declare to be His Body, but the word in the mystery of which that bread was to be broken. Nor did He say that that visible drink was His Blood, but the word in the mystery of which that drink was to be poured forth."[1] The Fathers at Nicæa:—"Let us not fix our thoughts unworthily on the bread and the cup set before us, but lifting up our mind, let us by faith deem that on that holy table is lying the Lamb of God."[2] S. Athanasius:—"Speaking of

[1] In S. Matt. Ev. Comm. § 85. Opp. tom. iii. p. 898.

[2] Hist. Conc. Nic. Gelasio Cyzic. ascr. c. xxx. Mansi. tom. ii. col. 888.

the eating of His Body, and seeing many scandalized thereby, the Lord said, 'Does this offend you? What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where He was before? It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life.' . . . . For, for how many would His Body suffice for food, that this should be the food of the whole world? But He made mention of the ascension into heaven of the Son of man with a view to withdraw them from the corporeal notion, and that they might also understand that the flesh, of which He spake, is heavenly food, from above, and a spiritual nourishment given by Him."[1] S. Augustine:—"We receive visible food, but the Sacrament is one thing, the virtue of the Sacrament another." "'This,' then, 'is the bread which cometh down from heaven that a man may eat thereof and not die'; but it is that which belongs to the virtue of the Sacrament, not that which belongs to the visible Sacrament: it is he who eats inwardly, not outwardly, he who eats in his heart, not he who presses with his tooth."[2] S. Nilus:—"Not as of common bread and wine to the satisfying of the belly do we partake of that awful and desirable table in the Church; but a share is given to us of a small portion by those who

[1] Ep. ad Serap. iv. § 19. Opp. tom. i. P. ii. pp. 567, 568. Patav. 1777. The Eucharist is not expressly named in this passage; but the allusion cannot be doubted.

[2] Tract. in Joh. Ev. xxvi. §§ 11, 12; tom. iii. P. ii. col. 1983.

minister to God, and we partake *gazing intently aloft with the eyes of the soul*, that we may be cleansed from our sins, and attain to holiness and salvation." [1]

Thus thought and spoke the pious teachers of the early Church. With the most reverent belief in Christ present, and "verily and indeed received by the faithful" in this holy ordinance, and though perpetually, as was most natural, and as He Himself had taught them, giving the Name of the Divine Reality to that which signified It, they yet remembered that the symbol is but the instrument that conveys Christ, and not Christ, in absolute identity, Himself. Him therefore they adored, not it. The earthly sign did not detain them upon earth. They looked beyond, they looked above. Through that which lay before them, their faith could see, as through a veil, Jesus once offered. The eye might rest on the material sign; but the soul beheld "the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God."

[1] Epp. l. ii. Ep. cxliv.; p. 186. Rom. 1668.

THE END.

Printed by Curtis & Beamish, Ltd., Coventry.

DATE DUE

BX 5149 .C5 S384 1902

Scudamore, W. E. 1813-1881.

The communion of the laity

DEMCO

UNITED THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BX5149.C5 S384 1902
Scudamore, W. The communion of the laity
3 0645 0008 4747 1